DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 186 668 CE 025 115

AUTHOR Hensley, Gene
TITLE Improved Career Education Policies through the Collaborative Efforts of Business, Industry, Labor, Government and Education. A Communications Project. Final Performance Report, October 1 1978, through November 30, 1979.
INSTITUTION Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.; Office of Career Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 79
GRANT G007802021
NOTE 102p.; For related documents see CE 024 173, ED 163 226, ED 166 542-545, and ED 167 775.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Agency Cooperation; *Career Education; Coordination; Educational Cooperation; Educational Legislation; Federallegislation; Industry; *Institutional Cooperation; National Surveys; *Policy Formation; Public Policy; *School Business Relationship; State Legislation; Statewide Planning; Unions
IDENTIFIERS Education Amendments 1974

ABSTRACT

To assist states in developing political/educational linkages that are basic to the implementation of career education, a national project was designed with three objectives: (1) to determine the nature and extent of the participation of business, industry, and labor in career education policy development and program implementation in each state, (2) to identify, classify, and report federal and state policies, laws, and regulations that have implications for planning, financing, and implementing career education at state and local levels, and (3) to develop, recommend, and facilitate alternative approaches to strengthening state education policies and legislation through the collaborative efforts of the constituency of the project. Information was collected through interviews with representatives of business, industry, labor, government, and education, and through a mail survey of agencies, individuals, and organizations. A twelve-member task force of nationally recognized experts and leaders of business, labor, industry, education, and government monitored all project activities, made recommendations based on collected data, and encouraged their use by individual constituencies. Four reports of survey findings and the model legislative and policy alternatives developed from their synthesis were published in a series of task force reports and recommendations (see Note). Two additional reports are forthcoming. (An interim performance report is available as CE 024 173.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED186668

Final Performance Report

October 1, 1978 through November 30, 1979

IMPROVED CAREER EDUCATION POLICIES THROUGH THE COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS OF BUSINESS, INDUSTRY, LABOR, GOVERNMENT AND EDUCATION

A Communications Project

Grant No. G007802021

RECEIVED
NOV 23 A 9:56
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Submitted to

the U.S. Office of Education
Grants and Procurement Management Division
Occupational and Adult Education Branch
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Submitted by

Gene Hensley, Project Director
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln St., Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295

CE 025 115

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Career Education Program
Project Performance Report

(In response to OE Form 467, 2/76)

1. 554AH70459

2. G007802021

3. Final report

4. Improved Career Education Policies through the Collaborative Efforts of Business, Industry, Labor, Government and Business

5. October 1, 1978 through November 30, 1979

6. Communications Project

7. Gene Hensley, Project Director

8. Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295

Preface

From its earilest beginnings, the Education Commission of the States has been deeply concerned with the transition between school and work. Problems and issues in the general domain of "education/ work" have been focal points for discussions at annual meetings of the Commission for more than ten years and have been the subject of numerous occasional papers and articles produced by the Commission. The Commission, however, officially indicated its interest in career education in 1975 when, at an annual meeting, Representative Leo Lucero of Colorado submitted a resolution calling for the organization of a national task force, or the development of other means, to bring about the cooperation of business, industry, education , labor and state government to strengthen the relationship between work and education. In 1976 the Commission received a small grant ($50,000) from the Region VIII Office of Education to develop conference materials and position papers that could be utilized in the 1976 annual meeting of the Commission.

The 1976 annual meeting had as its theme--The Improvement of Education/Work Relationships. Through a series of planning and writing activities prior to the 1976 annual meeting, ECS produced a number of discussion papers. Included were: (1) a discussion paper on bridging the gap between education and work; (2) a summary of 1975 state legislative and program activities dealing with education and work; (3) an historical summary of career education activity in the United States; and (4) two papers summarizing available resources for states in the general fields of career/ vocational education. More than 300 education and political leaders deliberated on

education/work issues and offered suggestions as to how education, business and labor could bring about increased cooperation, through ECS activities.

The outcome of the annual meeting included a summary of career and vocational education alternatives for states that covered both political and education issues. As a result of these efforts, two papers were published* which dealt with synthesizing work/ education relationships and a summary of 1975 state activities. These publications were widely distributed to ECS constituents and others. In the Spring 1976 issue of ECS COMPACT magazine, an article entitled "Reflections on Education and Work: What Are Schools For?" provided an insightful overview of the career education movement.

Since 1976 the staff of the Elementary/Secondary Department has participated in numerous career education activities throughout the nation. For example, in 1977 ECS constituents and staff participated in conferences sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education, the National Institute of Education (NIE), the Career-Education Forum and the Commissioners' National Conference on Career Education. ECS staff also participated in a career education conference series that was jointly sponsored by the National School Boards Association and the American Association of School Administrators. During that time period staff also reported to the National Advisory Council on Career Education concerning ECS activities. In December 1976 the

*Career Education and Vocational Education: 1975 State Activity (Denver, Colorado, Education Commission of the States), May 1976; Synthesizing Work and Schooling: The Roles of Community and Society (Denver, Colorado, Education Commission of the States), September 1976.

National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) the largest of ECS' projects, reported the findings of their first assessment of career and occupational development. The results were widely disseminated across the country. Additional analyses of these data were made possible by a grant from the U.S. Office of Career Education, along with the development of an illustrated brochure summarizing the information resulting from the assessment. Also made possible by the grant was a kit of materials developed for the NAEP assessment that have been used in a variety of ways (i.e., to compare the performance of a given student group with national performance level, as all or part of a career education needs assessment, etc.). The brochure and assessment kit were also widely disseminated.

In the fall of 1977 NAEP completed the objectives for a second assessment of career and occupational development.* The results of the assessment were intended to indicate whether knowledge, attitudes and skills had improved since the first assessment was conducted in 1973-74, when the career education movement gained much of its impetus and current momentum (with the enactment of P.L.93-380, the Education Amendments of 1974).

The National Assessment of Educational Progress also received a grant from the National Institute of Education (NIE) to study the performance and participation of women in mathematics. This study dealt with concerns such as the apparent female shunning of mathematics, and was concerned with possible contributing factors such as sex-stereotyping, attitudes and abilities of students,

*Career and Occupational Objectives: Second Assessment (Denver, Colorado, National Assessment of Educational Progress) 1977).

parents, peers, teachers, counselors--and their expectations of youth--and demographic factors such as race, parental education and school course offerrings. These data were intended to aid education policy makers in finding ways to bring about change, since a decision not to take mathematics can significantly limit womens career flexibility.

In the fall of 1977 ECS received a one-year grant from the U.S. Office of Career Education to fund the ECS Career Education Project. The grant provided funding for (1) the development of information to determine the nature and extent of participation of business, industry and labor in career education policy development and program implementation in each state (and efforts to increase that participation); (2) the identification, classification and reporting of federal and state policies, laws and regulations that have implications for planning, financing and implementing career education to include the development of legislative alternatives; and (3) developing, recommending and facilitating the implementation of alternative approaches to strengthening state education policies through the cooperative efforts of business, industry, labor and education.

The second Career Education Project (covered in this report) was in a sense an extension and expansion of activities conducted during the first project year. The data collection activities, task force deliberations and project findings provided clear evidence that there was a continuing need to assist states in developing political/educational linkages that are basic to the implementation of career education, and that there was an increasing demand for the

type of information being generated by this project. Specifically to:

- o Seek to improve career education policies through the collaborative efforts of business, industry, labor, government and education.
- o Continue to assess the nature and extent of the participation of business, industry and labor in career education policy development and program implementation in each state.
- o Further identify, classify and report federal and state policies, laws and regulations that have implications for planning, financing and implementing career education at state and local levels.
- o Further develop,recommend and facilitate alternative approaches to strengthening state education policies and legislation through the collaborative efforts of the constituency of the project.

The project was designed to provide at least five products or outcomes that would be useful to state leaders.

1. The collaboration of business, industry, labor and government in career education policy and program development would be continuously analyzed and alternative approaches for improving efforts would be identified and reported to the states.
2. State and federal laws, policies and regulations related to career education would be collectged on a continuing basis and this information would be disseminated in readily usable form to the states.
3. Alternative approaches to strengthening state career education policies and laws would be identified, noting particular opportunities for participation of business, industry and labor leaders.

4. Continuing information and consultative services within the limit of the project's budget would be provided to state policy makers (i.e., business, industry and labor leaders, state boards, legislative committees, and governors offices).

5. Policy options and legislative information (i.e., alternative legislative approaches that could be utilized for analyzing and assisting state legislative efforts) would be provideed to national, regional and state business, labor and political education organizations upon requests (i.e., National Conference of State Legislatures, National Governor's Association, AFL-CIO, United Auto Workers, National Association of Industry-Education Cooperation etc.).

At the time that the second year proposal was submitted, Congress had recently enacted the Career Education Incentive Act (P.L. 95-207) demonstrating a national commitment to the idea that career education should become an integral part of our school programs and of our overall educational philosophy. This commitment was predicated on several assumptions: (1) that educators can and should incorporate information in the occupational, volunteer and lesisure time activities that may be developed from the subject matter being taught; and (2) that students can and should be encouraged to think, as they learn about their futures--as productive members of the labor force, family members and individuals.

The potential consequences for education from this national commitment were profound, and still are. Further, they continue to represent an opportunity for educational change and reform that should not be dissipated by failure on the part of the various actors within the education system to respond in appropriate ways. Indeed, no effort at structural change of this magnitude can succeed unless a majority of the decisionmakers within the system accept these types of innovations and commit themselves to their implementation and

long-term success. Five years, the time permitted by the new law (the Career Education Incentive Act) is a brief period of time to bring together and to gain the necessary commitment of these diverse groups and individuals.

The second year proposal, therefore, was intended to address a central issue in effecting the type of structural change that will be necessary if the goals of career education are to continue to be met. The fact that states and territories are responsible for our national education system suggests that they are essential to the success of any national effort involving systemic change. The very nature of career education requires the drawing in of new facilitators into the formulation of educational policy--representatives of business, industry and labor--who have not traditionally participated in policy development activities at the state level.

Although state officials across the country remain keenly aware of the challenges presented by the career education movement, and have evidence a significant commitment toward meeting that challenge, there continues to be a number of obstacles to achieving a kind of systemic change that will ensure the long range success of the career education movement. Throughout the two-year tenure of this project, the national task force which guided its efforts felt that it could not be stated too strongly that career education was more than a course offerring and more than a change of curriculum in the nations schools. Because career education must become integral to the education of all students--including those who are handicapped, disadvantaged, minority, young or old, male or female--it requires a careful rethinking of our educational policies in all areas of

education at all levels.*

Comprehensive policy review is particularly important at the state level, where responsibility for all education is formally lodged. Further, if such rethinking is to be productive--to facilitate the transition from school to work for individual students--then the representatives of business, industry and labor must be involved in it.

This project therefore was designed to assist state officials to strengthen their career education policies, legislation and programs for working collaboratively with business, industry and labor.

Although the ECS Career Education Project officially ended on November 30, 1979, this organization will continue to support career education and related activities and will seek funding to support additional dissemination activities, studies and convening activities focused on various problems and issues that have to do with the improvement of education/work linkages. At the present time ECS is seeking support and funding for a national Forum that will include representatives from education, industry, labor and state government. The purpose of this forum will be to (1) identify topics for study that have to do with the education/work transition; (2) publicize

*Particularly noteworthy are various legislative activities (such as the 1976 Virginia Legislation--The Standard of Quality Act (HB256). This statute provided by September 1978, the State Board of Education, in cooperation with local districts, was to establish specific minimum state-wide educational objectives and a uniform state-wide test in reading, communications and mathematics skills. It also set standards for special education, gifted and talented students, personnel, teacher preparation, testing measurements, accreditations, planning, public involvement, and district policy manuals--as well as career preparation. Virginia was not alone in passing legislation that was both comprehensive and that included a career education component.

there importance; and (3) seek alternative strategies for bringing about increased cooperation among this diversified constituency for improving existing and future education/work linkages with emphasis on the 1980s and beyond. The idea for a forum of this type grew out of the activities of the ECS Career Education Project sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education and the recommendations of its national task force. There is much yet that needs to be done and we hope to continue to address this important initiative through future ECS activities.

Major Activities

From the outset it was anticipated that this project would, over a period of time, result in increased awareness of the need for career education among state policy makers and business, labor and industry leaders. It was anticipated that this increased awareness would begin to develop during the scond year of activities, through the expanded knowledge of policy and legislative activity in the states, and that this awareness would ultimately lead to increased commitments to provide useful career education programs through the involvement of state leaders in the development of state policies and legislation in career education. It was, however, pointed out in both the first and second year proposals that this increased awareness would be subject to a number of variables over which the national task force and the project staff might have little control (i.e., the governing structure of states and the place of career education in that structure, the ultimate support for career education programs at state and local levels among policy makers in individual states, the availability of funds to support new education

programs, including career education at state levels, the levels of support available to states and local districts from the Career Education Incentive Act (P.L. 95-207), and the speed with which this act can be implemented, as well as the impact of various other education/work federal and state incentive programs on efforts to expand career education.) It was further anticipated that this increased awareness would begin to develop at some time during the second year's activities through the expanded knowledge of policy and legislative activity in the states, and that this awareness would ultimately lead to increased commitments to provide useful career education and related programs through the involvement of state leaders and the development of policies and legislation in career education. There are several indications that this increased awareness has begun to develop and there is every reason to expect that it will continue, although it is impossible to attribute these gains directly to the activities of the project and the recommendations of our national task force since there are many other efforts now underway to communicate the importance of career education to the public and private sectors. One of the difficulties in assessing the growth and understanding of career education practices among policy makers is the fact that there have been many other education/work intiatives introduced during the past 18 months of which career education is an integral part (i.e., youth employment and economic development initiatives at federal and state levels). From our perspective some of the indicators that there is now an increased awareness of the importance of career education include the following:

1. Career education has maintained a high priority among ECS Commissioners (governors, state legislators and education leaders. In a 1978 survey of ECS Commissioners, designed to prioritize education issues, career education ranked in the third priority level and number eight in an overall list of 32 education issues that warranted immediate attention by ECS staff. Career education has maintained a high priority position over the past two years and has not changed in its relative degree of importance as identified by Commissioners (ECS 1979 priorities survey). Further, two resolutions were introduced at ECS meetings in support of career education activities at the policy levels and passed unanimously. In addition, members of the ECS task force were asked to appear before the Steering Committee at the 1979 annual meeting of the Commission in Seattle, Washington. At that time, the work of the ECS task force in career education received unanimous support and it was recommended that policy activities currently being conducted by the task force be expanded. This is currently being accomplished through efforts to develop a national forum of education leaders to address education/work initiatives, including career education, and to make recommendations in regards to ways that improved education/work transitions can be effected.

2. From the time the first project publications were developed and disseminated, there has been an unprecedented demand for these materials by policy leaders throughout the United States. In fact, the initial printing of the first four publications that dealt with career education legislative activity in the states, policies and priorities of the labor and education organizations, model legislation and ways of improving collaborative activities among industry, education and labor and education of state government leaders, was exhausted after a few weeks. These publications were reissued a second time and are still in heavy demand. Although the project is now ended we are now receiving daily requests for multiple copies of these publications to be used by state advisory councils, education, labor and political organizations and others in planning and implementing their studies of education/work issues.

3. Other ECS projects (i.e., Migrant Education) are now being asked by their respective constituencies to work closely with ECS staff responsible for education/work activities to ensure that career education and related programs becomes an integral part of their efforts to improve education. Although these requests are just now beginning to occur, it seems likely that they will continue and it is expected that the work of the national task force on career education will be reflected

in future elementary/secondary and postsecondary projects of the Commission.

As to a commitment on the part of state leaders to provide useful career education programs through the involvement of state leaders and the development of policies and legislation in career education, the final outcome remains to be seen. It may very well be that this increased commitment will not be clearly visible for at least another 12 to 24 months. As mentioned earlier, it was pointed out in the original proposals for this project that an increased commitment to the expansion of career education policy activities would probably occur over a period of time, but that a strict timeline for this commitment to occur could not be realistically projected. For example, there has recently been a decline in requests for publications and services from project staff to work with state leaders in developing state policies and legislation in career education, although this decline for services and products might be expected to occur during the second half of the final project year in any program. Many users of services automatically assume that when a project is ending, direct services from staff are not readily available. It is also possible to speculate that we have reached a type of "plateau" and that there will be a renewed interest in the types of products and services offered by this project at a later time, perhaps in the 1980-81 state legislative sessions. For one thing, there was significant delay in funding the Career Education Incentive Act (P.L. 95-207) and significant reductions in the amount of money that states could expect to receive. In this regard, many states were forced to temporarily curtail major career

education activities. One has only to realize that many states found themselves without immediate funds to support the services of career education coordinators. The fact that almost half of the current career education coordinators are relatively new on the job, having been employed since funds from P.L. 95-207 were allocated is significant. It seems plausible that a reduction in requests from state leaders for service was related to this circumstance. On the other hand, the very fact that P.L. 95-207 is an incentive act, developed with the expectations that states will ultimately assume major responsibility for the implementation of strong career education programs and will support them with funds generated by state legislatures, may have resulted in the assumption of some state leaders that the time is not yet right (in 1979-80) for significantly increasing their policy development and legislative activities. In other words, there has been the feeling expressed on the part of some state leaders that ultimately strong career education policies and legislation will be needed but that significant activity in this area should be postponed until the states are in a position to assume greater responsibility for improving the quality of career education programs through comprehensive state policy development. In short, it is the feeling on the part of project staff that career education is alive and well, that it has been overshadowed somewhat by a number of other education/work initiatives that have been developed over the past 12 to 18 months but that we can expect a resurgence of interest in policy and legislative activities in career education, per se, sometime within the next two years.

The following outline of major activities (including objectives)

has been taken from the proposal that was submitted for second year funding (October 1978 through September 1979).

Objective No. 1 -- Providing State Officials with Alternative Methods of Obtaining the Active Involment of Business, Industry, Education and Labor in Career Education Policy Development and Program Implementation and to Strengthen that Participation

Based on findings of national surveys and subsequent task force deliberations conducted during the first year of the project, states were contacted in regards to their need for information on state and federal legislation and proposed state and federal legislation that affects career education policy development planning and programming (including any court challenges). As a result of our offer to provide such information, project reports summarizing state and federal legislative activity, draft (model) legislation and state policy summaries were disseminated to more than 3,000 (estimate) organizations and institutions and state offices over a two year period. ECS is now receiving requests for multiple copies of these publications (15 to 300) to be used by state planning groups. These materials have served to generate numerous requests for more specialized information in regards to youth employment, teacher preparation, etc. As a result, not only did the career education project disseminate its own products but prepared a number of specialized summaries of information particularly tailored for various sources requesting the information. In the many cases where we could not provide information appropriate to the particular request, referral was made to such groups as the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National Association of State Boards of

Education, the National School Boards Association, the National Manpower Institute and the National Association of Industry-Education Cooperation. Project staff and individual members of the task force maintained close liaison with all political and education organizations that were in a position to provide specialized information that was not directly available from the project. During the second project year, project staff began to offer more direct assistance to states, providing our products and direct services whenever possible, depending on budget limitations. Project staff provided direct assistance to a number of states, meeting with state advisory councils and others, to present information on alternative legislative approaches and possible ways of strengthening career education activities through the collaborative efforts of industry, education, labor and government. As a result of contacts with the states during the early months of the second project year, approximately 34 indicated that they hoped to utilize technical assistance capabilities of the project over the next several months. Project staff did meet with various groups (i.e., New York, Texas, Alabama, Indiana, South Carolina and Utah over an 18 month period) to address various problems having to do with ways that career education programs could be strengthened through the development of appropriate policies. Although more than half the states did indicate their interest in receiving direct services from project staff, the fact that a relatively small number of states requested these services in late 1979 can probably be attributed to various delays associated with the funding of the Career Education Incentive Act (P.L. 95-207), as previously stated. It should be noted that in two cases (Texas

and Alabama) several trips were made to meet with state advisory councils and others in regard to policy development and legislative plans. In some instances, states noted that while they felt they would benefit from services offered by the project, budget limitations precluded their inviting project staff to meet with various groups of educators, legislators and others to address these issues. It should also be noted that one change in activities related to all three objectives during the second grant period was recommended and approved by our project monitor (Terry Newell). This change had to do with three proposed regional conferences as part of the project's dissemination efforts. It was felt that because of the many career education and related meetings being conducted throughout the United States, that this was not an efficient way of disseminating our products and achieving our goal of assisting states in improving policies and legislative development. As a consequence of this change, project staff intensified their efforts to participate in activities of other projects then funded by the Office of Career Education. Our decision to recommend that regional conference activities be deleted was primarily based on the following considerations: (1) requests to participate in individual state meetings to provide consultative services to states was growing and because of budgetary considerations (and reductions in the budget as originally proposed) it was decided that the money might more appropriately be reserved for direct services to individual states (budget for regional conferences was severly limited); (2) in checking for conflicts with other meetings sponsored by the Office of Career Education, it was anticipated that it would be extremely

difficult to interest large numbers of career education advocates in regional conferences at that time inasmuch as states differed significantly in regards to their career education policy and legislative needs; (3) project staff and individual task force members were continuing to receive requests to participate in state, regional and national meetings sponsored by other education organizations. For example, during the first six months of the second project year, project staff conducted legislative workshops with the National Association of Industry-Education Cooperation, the National Association for School Volunteers and the Council of Chief State School Officers. In fact, project staff participated in four regional conferences sponsored by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and one national meeting where legislative workshops were held for career education coordinators and other significant persons involved in career education activities. Once again, budgetary considerations were particularly important in this regard and every effort was being made to utilize funds in the most efficient way that would result in the best use of career education funds.

Over the next 12 months every will be made to assess the impact that the career education project may have had on those states that were directly served (implementation activities) and to seek ways that the Commission can be of assistance to those states, even though the funding for the career education project has now ended.

Objective No. 2 -- Providing State Officials with Alternative Legislative Approaches To Strengthening Career Education and to Report Federal and State Policies, Laws and Regulations that have Implications for Planning, Financing and

Implementing Career Education at State and Local Levels

Objective No. 3 -- To Develop, Recommend and Facilitate Alternative Approaches to Strengthening State Education Policies and Legislation through the Cooperative Efforts of Business, Industry, Labor and Education

Since the majority of the activities associated with addressing Objectives No. 2 and 3 overlap to some extent and are not mutually exclusive, it appears reasonable to report activities related to these objectives in a combined form. Further, activities relating to these objectives have to do primarily with (1) the contents of the project's six major publications and (2) the deliberations and recommendations of the national task force on career education. Further, the contents of the publications and the activities of the task force are interrelated. That is to say, the contents of the publications reflect the deliberations and recommendations of the task force and staff work regarding career education issues constituted the raw material which served as the basis for various task force meetings conducted over a two year period. In one sense, then, the contents of the publications and the recommendations of the task force contained in those publications, plus the resolutions adopted by the Commission in support of career education, provide the raw material for the final report.

Career Education: The Policies and Priorities of Businesses, Organizations and Agencies

One of the first efforts of the career education project at ECS was to gather information by contacting numerous groups and organizations to obtain policy statements, position papers,

resolutions or expressed organizational philosophyon the subject oof career education. Of particular interest was how the concept relates to each organizations goals and activities and how different kinds of organizations define the concept of career education. The effort to collect this material was no way intended to be a comprehensive survey. The list of those contacted was developed from a variety of sources. The search of the available career education literature, personal communications, pahmplets and other printed material provided names of businesses, agencies or organizations that might have an expressed point of view. In one sense, the effort was a "paper chase"--those who responded provided written clues as to what current ares of emphasis might be. In some cases unsolicited information was forwarded to the project by interested persons in both the public and private sector.

Many groups and organizations provided bits of information that did not fall into the classification of policy statements, position papers, resolutions or formal organizational philosophy. General support for the concept was expressed by nearly all such organizations, however, and many were involved in career education programs. The information from those who responded with an official statement was analyzed--in all, 44. The statements were divided into five categories, those from business/industry, labor, education, special interest groups and governmental education advisory councils. A review of the statements revealed common key words and phrases that tended to run throughout most statements. A check list of these terms is created in particular areas of emphasis by organizations were noted.

This approach was not intended to provide a comparative rating system to demonstrate good, less good, or poor concepts--the check list was developed only to show trends in areas of emphasis both with groups and across group lines. Judgements of this kind are bound to be somewhat subjective, although every attempt was made to avoid subjectivity. While the many organizations we contacted would no doubt respond affirmatively to most of the considerations listed on the check list, items were not checked unless a policy statement, resolution, or position paper specifically mentioned them. In other words, a survey was not conducted asking organizations for exhaustive replies with regard to their position in career education--rather, an analysis of formal written statements on the subject was made.

Career Education: Concepts and Components

Career education began taking hold in 1971 when Sidney Marland, then U.S. Commissioner of Education coined the phrase and gave the concept top priority. It can be broadly defined as an "effort aimed at refocusing American education and the actions of the broader community in ways that will help individuals acquire and utilize the knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary for each to make work a meaningful, productive and satisfying part of his or her way of living.*

*Kenneth B. Hoyt. A Primer for Career Education, Monographs in Career Education, Office of Career Education, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, p. 5. This publication and other monographs of the Office of Career Education have been major contributors to the development of the existing conceptual base for career education and were extensively utilized by project staff. They have also contributed to the development of organizational policies in both the private and public sectors, and with the contents of this report as well.

With varying degrees of emphasis, the policy statements, resolutions and position papers analyzed stressed the following key concepts of career education as both desirable and necessary:

- Preparation for successful working careers should be a key objective of all education. In every course, teachers should emphasize whenever appropriate the career implications of the substative content they teach.

- Preparation for careers should stress the importance of work, attitudes, basic skills, self-assessment and understanding, human relations skills, responsible citizenship, orientation to the world of work, understanding the economic system, exposure to alternative career choice as well as the acquisition of the actual job skills. The goal of education should include emphasis on preparing the school leavers to change with change in the world of employment.

- Learning should not be reserved to the classroom alone. Learning environments should be identified in the home, the community, with private and public employers, and labor organizations. Students must be given an opportunity to become aware of and explore occupations through direct interaction with the physical and human resources that the business/industry, labor, professional and government communities. Work experience--paid or unpaid--must become an education option available to all students; it must not simply remain an alternative program for those who have failed to profit from the academic curriculum.

- Career education is part of lifelong learning. It should begin in early childhood and continue throughout the regular school years, allowing enough flexibility for students to leave school, gain experience and then return to school for further education. It should include options for upgrading the education skills of adults and should contribute to the productive use of leisure time into the retirement years.

- Career education should be a basic and pervasive approach to all education and should compliment other legitimate education objectives (including citizenship, family responsibility, basic education, etc.). Pupils can acquire skills, knowledge and attitudes career education seeks to convey while simulatneously being motivated to learn and increase the amount of subject matter actually assimilated.

- The full range of educational and occupational opportunities must be made available, to the greatest extent possible, to minority persons, handicapped persons and women, as well as to others in society.

- A clear distinction should be made between vocational education and career education. Vocational education represents a body of substantive knowledge designed to provide students with specific vocational skills necessary for entry in the occupational society. Career education, on the other hand, is an instructional strategy to be threaded through all instructional programs at all levels of education. It is designed to provide students with the skills and attitudes needed to adapt to a changing society.

- Guidance and counseling programs should be expanded to assist young people in making wise career choices, and to include services devised and operated throughout the community to assist persons in the career development process.

- Career education is not a "add-on" approach to educational change. It involves changing attitudes, knowledge, skills and actions of all participants so that a refocusing of education can occur. Thus, in-service education is a topic of major importance for career education.

Career education, therefore, is not perceived by the groups and organizations contacted as only appropriate for a specific time segment in education (such as elementary or secondary school) or as separate subject matter (such as vocational or academic education). It encompasses both of these and more--it is a basic part of all education. Career education is seen as a means of achieving a specific objective--successful career performance--which is practical, measurable, and not exclusive of other legitimate objectives. A key concept is that all honest and productive human activity is honorable and legitimate. Career education involves the identification of attributes that make for lifetime career success, whether as employee or employer, laborer or professional, and is seen as denying to the schools any monopoly as a learning environment,

while giving to the schools a key role in identifying and coordinating all learning environments, that can further career goals.

These beliefs are reflected throughout the various statements included in this report and are the basic underlying assumptions that have given career education its own uinque identity. They have also provided a strong conceptual base which continued development as a major approach to educational change.

In addition to the discussion of concepts and components of career education, this report contains a discussion of areas of organizational emphasis (i.e., what various organizations and agencies want or don't want to see in career education). Too, various suggestions for action as recommended by the task force (see section of report on task force activities).

Legislating for Career Education: A Handbook for State Policy Makers

This report represents an effort to translate the views and objectives of the ECS task force on career education and the legal provisions that are both comprehensive in their scope and, at the same time, practical. Thus, the report is primarily a creation of the task force. In this report, the career education task force has dealt with a wide variety of practical matters. Should career education be enacted at all? How should it be paid for? How long should it take to achieve full implementation? How can ongoing efforts be built upon and encouraged? Given the wide variation among the states the ECS task force has made no attempt to provide final anwers to these questions, but they are dealt with so that the readers may find the approach best suited to their states. A strong

effort has been made to develop lelative provisions in this report that are unambiguous and as readable possible. Individual provisions are described in terms that are intended to clarify them, to explain their significance, and to promote discussion. To the extent that this report leads to a thoughtful discussion of the goals and objectives ov career education--and to the appropriate ways of achieving those goals and objectives--it will have fulfilled its purpose. This report is divided into five major sections:

1. Legislative Leadership: The Case for a Comprehensive Career Education Law

One of the first questions that appears when confronted with a proposal for legislation is "Why do we need it?" Various laws are enacted in most peoples mind to enforce them into behavior that they would not voluntarily adopt. There is a strong tendency to resist any encroachments by government on our freedom to solve problems in ways that are suited to our individual circumstances and needs. In education, new laws are often viewed as inimitable to the local control of the schools and the independence of educators to approach their responsibilities in a professional and responsive way.

All laws, however, are not designed to force a change in behavior. To the contrary, many were designed to provide needed support for activities that have already gained considerable acceptance. In many cases, when such laws are enacted, there are strings attached--they are normally designed to prevent abuse and to protect tax dollars (i.e., the public interest) rather than to force a change in behavior.

Some laws are a mixture in that they require a change while

providing the support needed to make the required change less burdensome. These types of laws are referred to as "Incentive Legislation" and represent a form of legislative leadership rather than an exercise of legislative authority. Ideally, they are designed to nurture a variety of locally determined approaches to meeting the goals and objectives of the legislature which are stated in very general terms in the law.

The approach to legislation proposed by the ECS task force in this document is an incentive approach, designed to encourage the full implementation of career education within a five year period.

2. Administrative Structures: The Local Level

There are a variety of factors that influence communities through their local boards of education to change their educational practices and procedures and to adopt an innovation that seems likely to address their most immediate concerns. An increase in school dropouts may prompt fears that the educational program is no longer relevant to young people. High rates of youth unemployment or a decline in achievement in the basic skills may fuel existing concern that the schools are not adequately preparing young people for the world of work. A taxpayer revolt may lead to a determination to provide "more education for the dollar." This section of the report discusses the creation of planning districts, local needs assessment and planning activities, the value of career education resource centers, the value of a long-term educational plan.

3. Administrative Structures: The State Level

At the state level, planning is also a major concern but it takes a different form since the state plan is a composite of local

planning activities based on locally identified needs. The state education agency, however, in addition to planning activities, has other important roles to play in encouraging the implementation of career education. The provision of information to the public and assistance to school districts are two of the major functions that can best be performed at the state level. This report discusses the importance of coordinating with related programs to achieve maximum efficiency, the purpose of the state education plan and state efforts to achieve the full implementation of career education within the state, and many of the important elements that might be included in a state plan.

4. Governance Structures: The Local Level

The governance of education has been entrusted to school boards, at both the state and local level and it involves a wide range of activities--from approving proposed budgets to providing the leadership necessary to bring about educational change (for example, desegregation of the schools). School board members, in addition to being lay citizens, are expected to be responsive to the views expressed by other lay persons and in so doing to ensure that schools respond to the need of the community and state. This section discusses the role of career education advisory ccouncils and the importance of developing a membership structure that is representative of the entire community.

5. Governance Structures: The State Level

There is still considerable confusion surrounding the concept of career education. The Office of Career Education has been given a heavy responsibility to provide information and assistance,

statewide, an important step in bringing about full implementation of the program. Leadership, however, requires more than the provision of information assistance--no matter how well both are provided. This section discusses the role of the state advisory council, and council membership. In essence, this section comments on the fact that with the establishment of the state advisory council, the state legislature will have provided for a state role in career education that has both leadership qualities and that provides support for planning and implementation efforts--in most cases the council should be specifically responsible for advising the state director of career education on the provisions of technical assistance and information across the state, and the various approaches to be taken that will result in the implementation of the state plan.

6. Funding and Programs

Funding provisions in incentive legislation provide a multiplicity of opportunities for the legislature--creating many questions about what funding combinations will be most effective. This material discusses the various steps in determining how much money should be spent specifically for the first year or two of the program, the setting aside of funds to be used at the state level for administrative purposes, providing for the distribution of funds between planning districts and various ways that special provisions can be included that require localities to set aside part of their funds for one or more mandated activities. In this section an approach to funding is suggested but little specific detail is provided. This generality reflects the recognition that wide variations tend to occur between states in the appropriate

local-state-federal funding mix and also the variation that will occur within states in terms of the progress that has already been made in implementaing career education at local levels.

7. Suggested Provisions for a Career Education Act

For many policy makers, this material may be the most useful contained in this publication. Suggested provisions include: (1) a suggested definition; (2) legislative purpose; (3) creation of career education planning districts; (4) the development of career education plans; (5) establishment of an Office of Career Education; (6) duties and responsibilities of local career education advisory councils; (7) establishment of a state career education advisory council; and (8) authorization.

Collaboration in State Career Education Policy Development: The Role of Business, Industry and Labor

Since the concept of career education was first introduced, there has been an increased emphasis on encouraging collaboration between educators and the community. There are many types of resources that can contribute to the success of career education, including different types of employers, both large and small businesses, profit and nonprofit making organizations, federal and state governments, etc. Also, there are various types of educational settings that must be considered, including hospitals, libraries, trade schools and apprenticeship programs, as well as community colleges and others. In addition, there are many private individuals who are active within the community who serve as volunteers, as professionals or as amateurs (for example, amateur archeologists).

The wide variety of resources that exist within the community

greatly enrich the educational system when they are called upon to do so and when, as a result of a cooperative or collaborative approach, available resources within the community are targeted to meet the needs of individual students for current information and opportunities to participate in the wide variety of career opportunities available to them. If collaboration among all of these various resources does in fact occur, career education can become much more than a new program. It can, in fact, become an agent for educational change that contributes to individualized instruction and to orienting various instructional efforts in ways that are particularly relevant to students with individual goals and capabilities.

The work of the ECS task force on career education called for a review and analysis of the nature and extent of business/industry and labor involvements in state career education policy formulation and an ultimate assessment of factors that encourage or tend to hinder collaboration between these groups and the education community. This particular report was created to assist in improving state career education policies through collaborative efforts. It contains in the analysis of survey responses the perceptions of state officials concerned with career education and the perceptions of representatives of business/industry and labor about collaboration at the state level and the development of effective policies and plans for career education. It also contains recommendations of the task force for improving collaborative efforts in the policies and plans that hopefully will result from these efforts.

There are many benefits to be gained from the involvement of

employers and labor leaders in the educational process since they are in possession of accurate and current career information and are concerned about both high unemployment rates and the lack of a qualified population. From the standpoint of employers, although schools and colleges are increasingly preparing the students to successfully enter the world of work, many students are leaving the educational system unprepared to do so. The active involvement of employers serves to assure a better understanding on the part of education of future labor needs and is likely to yield support for those educators who are interested in strengthening the capacity of the educational system to meet those needs. Labor leaders continue to recognize the value of career education as a means of providing students with a more accurate understanding of our economic system and of combating misinformation and stereotyped attitudes about the labor movement and the roles of unions in bargaining collectively to improve the lives of working people. They, too, share a fundamental concern about the quality of preparation that students receive prior to entering the labor force. Labor leaders tend to support career education because if offers opportunities for the offspring of union members to become involved in a variety of career options that they might otherwise be privvy to and to develop their career interest to their maximum capability. This report deals heavily with the collaborative process and offers a variety of examples of the value of collaborative efforts. In addition, it discusses the role and responsibility of state career education coordinators for the development and implementation of career education policies across the country. It further provides a series of summaries and

recommendations based upon task force deliberations that are focused on the value of the collaborative process.

An Overview of State Career Education Laws

One useful tool when new legislation is being considered in any state is a collection of similar legislation that has been enacted by other states. Although the details may be inappropriate, the approach and many of the individual provisions may be well suited to the needs of a state on the verge of legislating new programs.

In recent years, various state legislatures have enacted new laws in the area of career education and related areas. Existing laws contain a wide range of approaches, from fairly limited resolutions to fully developed career education legislation. In some states, career education has also been integrated into legislation that is concerned with education reform.

As an aid to individuals who are beginning to review approaches to developing state career education legislation, existing legislation has been compiled and is included in this volume. It is developed to serve as a companion to various other reports that have been issued by the career education project. The legislation contained in this report has been grouped into categories:

- Appropriations/resolutions typically indicate that the report of the legislature for a given program or concept, but provide more general information, if any, on how the program should be implemented. Actual program implementation is left largely to the discretion of the administering agency and is often optional.
- Reportive legislation--simply creates the structure or mechanisms that further ongoing or prospective implementation activities at the local level (e.g., career education resource centers).

- Implementation legislation--provides for program implementation although varying degrees of discretion are left to the administering agency, sufficient structure, program content and funds are provided by the legislature to assure that the programs will be implemented in a predictable way.

- Education Program Legislation--is legislation in which career education is viewed as an agent of education reform. The last chapter of this particular report contains state-by-state accounts of career education legislation so that the reader may quickly review which states have career education legislation and in summary form, what the nature of the legislation is.

  Finally, this report indexed topically to enable the reader to locate legislative provisions dealing with postsecondary education, inservice education, etc. and margin notations to permit easy reference. Also, the agencies or groups are individually referred to in individual legislative divisions indicated in the margin to indicate who is involved or assigned the responsibility in the provision.

In future legislative sessions, a number of states will be reviewing legislative proposals for career education; in other states, prospective career education legislation is now being discussed and may be drafted for introduction in future sessions. The staff of the ECS career education project, although the project has ended, will continue to monitor these efforts with the intention of providing up-to-date information on legislative activities. Readers are encouraged to forward to the project any information that may be available to them on the status of career education in their state.

This report, therefore, contains legislation introduced in the past in states that can be classified as (1) appropriations and resolutions, (2) supporting legislation, (3) implementation legislation,and (4) education reform legislation.

Finally, this report contains state-by-state narratives of

legislation that was enacted in each of the 21 states at the time of the publication of this material.

Legislative Update: 1980

This report, which was originally planned to be issued in 1979, is a report that deals with legislation that was introduced or passed since report No. 119, An Overview of State Legislation, was disseminated in January 1979. It was delayed in the hope that project staff would be able to provide readers with the most current legislative and policy development activities that have transpired since issuing the January 1979 report. This report deals with some of the major issues that states must consider in developing comprehensive career education policies and legislation, but will only reflect what has transpired to our knowledge since previous reports were issued. Copies of this report will be disseminated to the Education Commission of the States' constituency in early 1980.

As originally conceived, this report was to be directed toward legislative approaches to implementing career education policy decisions. After numerous task force deliberations it was decided that a more important focus would be to develop a report on career education for special populations. Two of the preceding reports were concerned with the development of comprehensive state career education legislation; and two were concerned with strengthening the collaboration of business/industry and labor in the development of career education policies. These four reports dealt with the concept of career education in general terms, as a means of responding to the need that all young people have to relate all they are learning in the classroom to the outer world around them and specifically, to

their own possible future roles within an adult world.

Career Education: A Tool for Meeting the Needs of Special Populations

This particular report is based on the recognition that while all children have this need in common, some children have specialized needs that will limit their ability to succeed in the education system and later will tend to result in their joining those adults who are structurally unemployed or underemployed. Regardless of ability, children with special educational needs are also those who, as adults, typically find themselves in the lower rungs of the economic ladder, unable to find jobs "in bad or good times." This report, therefore, which is yet to be diseminated, will be concerned with those special education needs that are those that tend to prevent students from succeeding in traditional classroom settings. These needs can result from differences in culture or language, from economic disadvantagment to stereotyping, from mental or physical handicaps, from relative geographical isolation or from frequent changes in residence--or from variations or combinations of these factors. This report, therefore, is now entering completion and, when issued, will provide leaders with a discussion of the heterogeneous classroom, the role of career education providing for special populations of all types including the role of women in the transition from education to work and the subculture of poverty. It is intended to provide policy makers with basic information to lead to better understanding of the role that career education can play in providing for more efficient education practices focused on the important role of career education in dealing with the special populations of all kinds.

For more detailed information, readers are urged to contact the Education Commission of the States to secure copies of the above described publications and for additional information that has been produced through occasional papers, individually designed pieces of information and special reports for the constituency of the Commission.

Task Force Activities and Recommendations

In 1977, the ECS career education task force was developed to: (1) develop recommendations for states concerning policy and legislative options and alternative approaches for strengthening collaborative efforts of business/education/labor/government in career education, particularly at state levels; (2) give guidance to staff in carrying out tasks of the project; (3) advise ECS steering committee and other groups of their recommendations and seek ECS approval and promotion of those recommendations; and (4) work in their own states to promote effective working relationships with education/government and business/labor/industry leaders. In essence, this task force on career education was charged with the responsibility of studying career education and its many implications for our system of education. The task force has developed a number of recommendations. Among them are recommendations for career education and policy development. The task force, which was chaired by Governor George Busbee of Georgia, was composed of educators, political leaders and representatives of business, industry and labor. Each member was an advocate of career education and each had his/her own perspective about implemening career education in ways that would benefit students, schools and communities. The

recommendations were designed to encourage the full implementation of career education and, also, to preserve and protect those characteristics of career education that make it a desirable agent of educational change.

Other Task Force Activities

Under the provisions of the Special Projects Act (P.L. 93-380), the states received career education planning grants. The states developed career education plans as legislation was being considered by the Congress to provide funds for implementation purposes (that is, the bill that was enacted in December 1977 as the Career Education Incentive Act, P.L. 95-207). These separate, but closely related activities, resulted in the development of state planning efforts that were responsive to the requirements of P.L. 95-207 and, to an appreciable extent, based on the expectation that federal funds would be forthcoming for implementation purposes.

The members of the task force recognized that funding under P.L. 95-207 was of central importance to the states. When appropriations were under consideration in the spring of 1978, the task force submitted testimony urging full funding for the law (attached). Similarly, in 1979, when the appropriated funds ($32.5 million) were the subject of a recision request, the task force also acted in a concerted way in behalf of the states. As Warren Hill, ECS Executive Director, pointed out, a peremptory withdrawal of the appropriated funds could be expected to lead to "confusion, delays and additional unanticipated financial burdens" at state and local levels. Governor Busbee, in a letter to President Carter (also attached), pointed to the symbolic significance of the Administration's position and the

adverse eaffect if might be expected to have on the career education movement. The efforts of the task force, and other concerned agencies and individuals across the country, resulted in a compromise whereby the states received $20 million, allowing them to continue implementation activities as planned but at a slightly reduced level.

Finally, the task force responded to the proposed regulations for the Career Education Incentive Act, commenting on their suitability and appropriateness in meeting the needs of the states.

Recommendations

Major task force recommendations that have been included in publications, occasional papers and testimony provided to the Congress include:

1. Organization should review existing policy statements or resolutions to determine the extent to which they reflect current career education priorities and activities;

2. Organization should consider the possible advantages of working with other groups to achieve common goals in policy areas; it may be possible to create a unified and coordinated approach to career education without sacrificing individual group interests;

3. Inasmuch as collaboration among representatives of business/industry, labor and government and education is essential to the future success of career education, organizations and agencies currently engaged in cooperative activities should also analyze and note similarities and differences in formally-stated philosophies and policies is a first step in facilitating productive, role-oriented relationships;

4. In some cases, phrases such as "economic education," "citizenship," or "consumer education," mean different things to different people. Where the possibility of misunderstanding exists, terms should be clearly defined in organizational statements;

5. In some instances, policy statements have an empty ring in that they lead to no productive end. Policy statements should be reviewed to determine if they reflect a commitment to be involved in career education activities at the local, state or national levels.

6. In a wide variety of ways, business/industry and labor have both voiced and demonstrated their support for and commitment to the concept of career education. In general, their greater involvement will result simply from the extension of an invitation on the part of educators and/or state officials asking for their participation in the collaborative process. It is strongly recommended that such invivations be extended;

   a. Invitations to business, industry and labor should be forthcoming from high ranking state officials/educators, preferably both the governor and the chief state school officer. Their interest and concern not only establishes the legitimacy of the effort, it also helps to assure its success in terms of effecting the function of schools and colleges within the state;

   b. Similarly, invitations should be extended to high ranking officials--executive directors of major businesses, industries and labor unions. These are the individuals who can make available needed human and physical resources for implementing activities and they are also able to contribute knowledge and information that is essential to the establishment of effective career education policies and plans. Although business and labor leaders may appoint other persons to represent them, their initial and continued involvement even through an official or designated intermediary, is essential if the collaborative process is to be more than superficial;

   c. Invitations should be extended in ways that reflect an understanding of and a sensitivity to the needs and interests of the business/labor communities. Unless representatives of government/education express their awareness of and responsiveness to those factors that have led to business/

labor support for career education, true collaboration is not likely to take place.

d. An accurate assessment should be made of both the employing community and of state occupational data. Individuals should be identified who are representatives of large segments of the employing community within a state, as well as individuals who represent significant occupational groupings (for example, the health professions, the transportation indistry, etc.) both unionized and nonunionized. Such persons should be invited to participate in career education policy development.

e. The composition of advisory councils should be both diverse and representative. Thus, if the council is to remain manageable in size, members may need to play dual roles (small business/ minority representatives, parent/rural geographic area representative, etc.).

f. Individuals who have important perspectives to offer should be invited to participate in the policy development process and should be interviewed to ascertain what, if any, assistance will be needed to assure their full and active involvement. Such assistance should be provided to the maximum extent possible.

g. Career education is subject to different kinds of definitions and means different things to different people. It is not uncommon to find groups of people unanimously supporting "career education" but with a varieth of opinions as to what it actually is. It is recommended that the establishment of a common agenda can best be accomplished at the outset by focusing attention on the identification of a few commonly held objectives that need immediate concrete action. Long range objectives encompassed by a three to five year career education plan should also be established so that initial objectives can be modified in accordance with new and better information, resulting from ongoing implementation efforts. The establishment of long range objectives allows collaborative efforts to evolve, producing a stronger, more broadly based framework for more mutually cooperative activity. It should also be emphasized in the development of objectives and a common agenda for action that the basic goal of career education is educational change and

reform. Proposed activities should be evaluated in terms of their potential for bringing about significant improvement of the education process.

h. In regard to collaboration, it is recommended that changing those traditions that are obstacles to educational change should be viewed as one of the major objectives of collaborative efforts (rather than necessary evils that automatically limit what can be done). Those involved in collaborative processes should be fully informed of the existing structural and procedural limitations of the education system, the reasons for their existence, and the necessity of dealing creatively with them. Collaborative development of state career education policies and plans should be responsive to lcal needs and activities as determined by formal or informal needs assessment activities. A sustained effort should be made to identify the existing base of support for career education in the state, both in public and private sectors, and to communicate that information to policy makers in the executive and legislative branches of government. These individuals can further career education objectives far more successfully if they are fully informed of the bases for career education--at the local level and on the part of business, labor and political leaders.

i. In regard to coordination, it is recommended that a continuing effort should be made to identify and develop working relationships with groups and agencies within the state that are actively involved in career education or related activities. State career education planning objectives should include the avoidance of duplication of activities within the state and should encourage activities that are mutually supportive and would help to maximize the human resources available for implementation of career education. Further, a wide variety of state officials--concerned with equal employment opportunities, youth employment and CETA, equal education opportunity for women, the employment of handicapped individuals in vocational education to name a few--should be routinely consulted so that career education policies are comprehensive and consistent with other ongoing efforts within the state.

j. The burden placed on the state career education coordinator is great. In that regard, it is recommended that: among the most valuable resources of technical assistance for state career education coordinators are other state career education coordinators. These individuals often have developed successful approaches to identifying and involving the private sector in career education planning and implementation and have much to offer one another on a shared basis. State career education coordinators should establish and maintain close working relationships with one another as an ongoing form of mutual assistance. Further, other resources at the local, state and national level should be identified to provide state career education coordinators with all available information, materials and consultative assistance. Finally, all available resources that would be helpful to state career education coordinators are not, of course, outside the state. There are important resources within the state education agency and other state agencies and in the private sector. State career education coordinators should be encouraged to identify sources of information and assistance that would be beneficial to them and to advisory council members, and to fully utilize them.

k. Finally, the task force recommends that all policy makers should review the material contained in Legislating for Career Education: A Handbook for State Policy Makers, particularly the materials that deal with the case for a comprehensive career education law and the model statute (draft legislation) that is contained in this publication. The subject matter contained in this publication regarding administrative structures at state and local levels and governance structures and funding for programs should provide policy makers with information that is highly pertinent to their decision making roles.

Project Participants

The career education project of the Education Commission of the States indirectly serves, through publications and consultative services related to policy and legislative development, the following groups: governors, state legislators, state education board members, chief state school officers, career education coordinators and others

who require information on alternative methods of obtaining the active involvement of business, industry and labor in career education policy development and program implementation and who desire information on alternative legislative approaches to strengthening career education. Those persons actively assisting project staff include members of our national task force on career education. The composition of the task force is displayed on the participants summary form.

Evaluation

As was originally discussed with the project monitor, a project such as this one does not lend itself to conventional evaluation design such as might be found in a state or local program testing the efficacy of specific career education practices and the impact on student behavior. It was our intention during the first 12 months of the project to monitor all project activities and to be in a position to show at the end of the first grant period that we completed our tasks and hopefully accomplished our objectives.

With the exception of certain delays associated with the development of products (i.e., special task force reports, etc.) and resulting printing delays all project activities originally outlined for completion during the first project period were completed as scheduled.

Accordingly, during the second month of the first project year a detailed set of objectives and accompanying evaluation measures covering the first 12 months of the project were devedloped and send to our project monitor. Subtasks were expanded as requested during negotiations for the first project year. At that time it was noted

that the particular project activities initiated during the first project year would become part of intensive direct services during the second year's activities if funding was made available. The first project year involved a series of precise objectives that lent themselves to close scrutiny by project staff. Evaluation measures, procedures and rationale for each of the firtst 12 months objectives were reported in our first annual performance report (October 1977 through January 1979). These materials are once again included in the appendix of this report.

During the second project year, as mentioned in the second proposal and the interim performance report (October 1978 through March 31, 1979) we were entering into an implementation phase of the overall two year project. While the objectives for the overall two year period remained substantially the same it was virtually impossible to develop an evaluation plan that would show the impact of the overall project in meeting the broadly stated goals and objectives of the project. The strengthening of career education policies, for example, involves a continuous process at the state level over an indefinite period of time. The process includes (1) strengthening the involvement of business, industry, labor and education in formulating career education policies; (2) strengthening and refining the method (primarily legislative) through which career education policies are implemented; and (3) strengthening policies and legislation by providing for increasing the greater degrees of comprehensiveness. The career education project has today and will continue to assist in initiating some or all of these processes and materials developed by the project will continue to further that

effort in the future. However, although normal evaluation procedures were continuously adapted and remodified to assess the success of the project in meeting its objectives and to provide a framework for changing directions where necessary to best meet the overall objectives of the project it was pointed out that the overall results of the project cannot be expected o be quantitative or conclusive even at the end of the project. As mentioned earlier we continue to see solid evidence (i.e., use of materials prepared by the project and continued requests for the information of the kind that the project was originally designed to provide) we are not in a position to show that this project was singularly responsible for what appears to be increased knowledge of decision makers about career education or the speed with which they aproached career education implementation activities in the states. In the opinion of the Education Commission of the States, the national task force on career education and the staff responsible for carrying out the activities of the project--this project did have a major impact on career education practices at national, state and local levels. At some future time it may be possible to show in tangible and measurable ways that the activities of the ECS career education project did, in fact, contribute significantly to the rapid growth of interest in career education among education, political and other policy makers at state levels, but it is not possible at this time.

Anticipated Changes and/or Problems

At the time that the interim report of the second year's activities was submitted in May 1979, staff did not anticipate any major problems in continuing the project between the time of that

reporting and the end of the project. It should be noted once again, however, that one major change in activities related to all three objectives of the project during the second grant period was recommended by staff and approved by our project monitor (Terry Newell). This change had to do with three proposed regional conferences as part of the project's disseimation efforts. It was felt that because of many career education related meetings being conducted throughout the United States that this was not an efficient way of disseminating our products and achieving the goal of assisting states in improving policy and legislative development. Our decision to recommend that regional conference activity be deleted was primarily based on the following considerations: (1) request to participate in individual state meetings to provide consultative services to states was, at this time, greater than originally anticipated and because of budgetary considerations in the area of staff and task force travel, it was decided that money might be better reserved for direct state services wherever possible; (2) in checking for conflicts with other meetings sponsored by the Office of Career Education it was anticipated that it would be extremely difficult to interest large numbers of career education advocates in regional conferences at that time inasmuch as states differed significantly in regards to their career education policies and legislative needs; (3) project staff and individual task force members were, during the first six months of the second project year, receiving an unexpectedly large number of requests to provide information and to participate in state, regional and national meetings sponsored by other education organizations. For example,

during the first six months of the second project year project staff conducted legislative workshops with the National Association of Industry-Education Cooperation, the National Association for School Volunteers and the Council of Chief State School Officers. We were also receiving large numbers of requests by special interest groups (migrant education, special education, etc.) to report on state activities in career education policy and legislative development. Once again, budgetary considerations were particularly important in this regard.

An additional change in activities relates to Objective No. 3 as outlined for the second project year (develop, recommend and facilitate implementation of alternative approaches to strengthening state education policies and legislation through the cooperative efforts of busines, industry, labor and education). This change had to do with a major task that was originally contained in the second year proposal--prepare check list for individuals concerned with the development of career education policies. This task was deleted by mutual agreement of the ECS staff and the project monitor (Terry Newell) at the time of negotiations for the second proposal. It was deleted because of a budget cut of approximately $20,000. Additional cuts were made in staff travel, task force travel and other budget categories. This task was therefore not attempted.

One additional change was made that was associated with Objective No. 1 (to provide state officials alternative methods of obtaining the active involvement of business, industry, education and labor in career education policy development and program implementation, and to strengthen the efforts to increase that

participation). As originally proposed in both the first and second year proposals, project staff would "respond to requests for information and report information on successful approaches to involving business, industry, labor and education in the development of state career education policies and legislation." One of the subtasks associated with this task was to maintain McBee Card information systems with career information and referral sources coded by subject matter and to maintain records of information requests and the nature of response. Basically this was a clearinghouse function. It became apparent shortly after the beginning of the first year's activities and even more apparent in the activities during the second year that the McBee Card information system was not necessary. In fact, it became readily apparent that various materials collected by the project to serve as the basis for our clearinghouse activities did not require the extensive detailed recordkeeping that would be involved in the McBee system. We therefore reorganized our classification system into a much more useable process. Basically all materials collected from other career education projects and from the states were organized into the following categories: (1) state files--files which were maintained on each state with emphasis on education and political activities having to do with career education (e.g., a collection of bills, policies, resolutions, etc.) that were important in estimating the levels of career education activity in each state; (2) state plans--state plans were ruequested from constant use by career education project and other projects associated with the Commission; (3) historical mateerials on career education; (4) curriculum materials; and (5)

materials relating to other education/work initiatives (CETA, youth unemployment, etc.). These materials were constantly utilized by project staff in responsing to requests from state and national leaders. It was a much more subjective system but one that proved to be more useable than the original plan to transfer all information to McBee Cards. With the exception of those noted above, virtually all operational tasks associated with the project were completed as scheduled. Exceptions include two reports that were associated with Objective No. 3 (to develop, recommend and facilitate alternative approavhed to strengthening state education policies and legislation). These reports included: (1) a legislative report discussing alternative legislative approaches to implementing career education policy decisions; (2) a report that was to deal with major issues the states might consider in developing comprehensive career education policies. These reports were delayed because of recommended changes in directions that were provided by task force members at the final meeting of this group durng the second project year (after initial work had already begun). First, the task force felt that much of what was proposed for the legislative report had already been dealt with in a report that was issued shortly after the end of the first project year, Legislating for Career Education: A Handbook for State Policy Makers. This report was much more extensive than what had originally been proposed and was currently being utilized, and still is, by education and political policy makers throughout the United States. Second, the task force felt that a much more comprehensive report was needed that dealt with special populations in career education. It was therefore proposed

by ECS staff to task force members that the basic contents of the originally proposed reports be preserved but that two somewhat different documents would be issued; (1) a comprehensive report detailing sources of assistance to state policy makers would be prepared that dealt with career education needs for special populations, and (2) that a somewhat smaller report in the form of a legislative update concerning career education activities be issued as a follow-up to Report No. 119, Career Education Legislation in the States. Publication of these reports has been delayed because of the aforementioned changes in direction and also because it was the general feeling of staff that we might be able to prepare more substantive information, particularly in regard to state level legislative activities if we delayed final completion until legislative activity in the 1979-80 sessions was underway. These reports are now virtually completed and will be issued and distributed to the Office of Career Education and to the basic ECS constituency within the next 30 days. If there is a high demand for these publications ECS will seek additional sources of funding to disseminate these reports more widely.

All remaining copies of the six reports as well as copies of previously produced newsletters will be disseminated upon request by the Education Commission of the States as long as supplies last.

Dissemination Activities

The following products have already been disseminated to the project's constituency: Legislating for Career Education: A Handbook for State Policy Makers; An Overview of State Career Education Laws; Collaboration in State Career Policy Development: The Role of

Business, Industry and Labor; Career Education: The Policies and Priorities of Businesses, Organizations and Agencies. In addition, an occasional newsletter was disseminated during the second project year to policy makers throughout the United States (see appendix). When the final two reports are completed, they will also be disseminated to the basic constituency of the project.

These publications have been disseminated to governors, state legislators, state board members, local board members, leaders in business, industry and labor and state education personnel. The demand for these products has consistently been greater than was originally expected and more than 2,000 additional copies of the first four reports were distributed at the time of initial printing. Further, 2,000 additional copies of the first four reports were reprinted near the end of may 1979 and there is a continuous high demand for these materials.

In a real sense, the products produced by the career education project at ECS constitute the final reports of this project; inasmuch as they were based on the major objectives as originally stated during the first and second project years, contain recommendations of the national task force on career education and constitute the raw materials on which we hope that future decisions relative to the growth of career education policies at state levels will be made. These products were publicized in the general news media, in reviews by countless numbers of education/political publications and in all materials that are routinely disseminated by the Education Commission of the States (i.e., COMPACT magazine, steering committee reports, legislative review, and routine reports of ECS Commissioners).

Even more important all publications have routinely been provided to annual and semi-annual meetings of major national, regional and state education/political, industry and labor organizations and have been utilized extensively in steering committee meetings and annual meetings of the Education Commission of the States. They continue to attract the attention of our broad-based constituency.

Special Activities

As indicated in other sections of this report, the ECS career education project engaged in numerous liaison and consultative activities upon request. Highlights of these activities over a two year period are as follows:

National Interstate Conference on Employment Security Agencies Incorporated. Participation in this conference was in response from an iinvitation from the president of ICESA to address this national conference on the importance of collaboration of education, labor and industry in improving manpower systems; approximately 500 persons attended.	October 1977
Western States Career Education Conference, Los Angeles, California. To interpret the objectives of the ECS career education project and task force to California representatives of education, industry and labor at a major national conference. Approximately 1,500 persons attended.	October 1977
USOE Project Directors meeting, Washington, D.C. A meeting to orient new project directors to the goals and objectives of the Office of Career Education and to provide an opportunity for project directors of federally funded projects to share information and to learn more about various project activities.	November 1977
Meeting with representatives from the American Association of School Administrators, Council of Chief State School Officers, National Association of Industry-Education Cooperation, National School Boards Association and the National Association of State Boards of Education to develop tentative plans for 1977 and 1978, to coordinate major project activities and to iedntiry specific means of avoiding duplication of project activities. The meeting was in Washington, D.C. and one persom from each organization attended.	November 1977

Meeting with members of staff of the National Association of State Boards of Education to coordinate project activities and survey and data collection procedures.	November 1977
Career Education State Plan Project Directors meeting, Washington, D.C., to interpret the goals and objectives of the ECS career education project, particularly those relating to legislation, to the career education state plan directors and to seek their cooperation in meeting project objectives. Approximately 50 persons attended.	December 1977
Career Education State Plan Project Directors meeting (second meeting), Washington, D.C., to interpret the goals and objectives of the ECS career education project, particularly those relating to legislation, to the career education state plan directors and to seek their cooperation in meeting project objectives. Approximately 50 persons attended.	December 1977
Regional conference on education for work sponsored by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the American Vocational Education Association, Las Vegas, Nevada, to seek ways or providing continuity between career education, vocational education and other work related programs and to study various articulation models that are possible. Also to refine ways of improved cooperation between AACJC and ECS.	January 1978
Conference on career education and economic awareness to address conference participants on the initial activities of the ECS career education project and to seek ways of cooperating with such groups as the Industry Education Council of California, State Department of Education, Association of California School Administrators, etc.	January 1978
Meeting with Senator Gary Corbin's staff in Michigan to discuss potrential development of new career education legislation for Michigan. Meeting was also held with education advisor to Governor Milliken concerning state and national career education issues.	January 1978

Office of the Governor (Georgia) to meet with Governor Busbee and his education aides to discuss the implementation of career education in Georgia and to seek Governor Busbee's services as Chairman of the ECS national task force on career education.	February 1978
Meeting with Office of Education officials regarding career education policy development in the states, Washington, D.C. Also meeting with Congressional staff to develop liaison between ECS project and information users in Congress regarding state activities in career education.	February 1978
Governors Conference on Career Education (Alabama), The World of Work to address this conference (approximately 300 people) on collaborative efforts of government with education. Also to meet with representatives from the AFL-CIO, AT&T and other labor and education organizations to further develop liaison activities. Meeting with Alabama State Advisory Committee on matters relating to possible improvements of state legislation in Alabama.	March 1978
Meeting with the Governor of Georgia (George Busbee) to plan for the first meeting of the national task force on career education.	April 1978
First meeting of the national task force on career education to conduct initial task force business. This meeting included organizational considerations, special interest of task force members in business, industry and labor and initial report on the status of legislation and collaboration on policy issues in the states.	April 1978
Industry Education Councils of America, Phoenix, Arizona. Invitation to address the Arizona Industry Education Council on topics related to the work of the project and seek a close relationship with the Industry Education Councils of America. Approximately 75 persons attended.	April 1978
Meeting with regional state coordinators to report on progress of the ECS career education project; to inform them about legislative activities in their state and seek their cooperation. Meeting was held in Phoenix, Arizona; approximately 20 persons attended.	April 1978

Liaison with Governor Busbee's staff to develop joint testimony for Congressional appropriation committee hearings on funding for the Career Education Incentive Act, P.L. 95-207. The testimony was ultimately submitted in behalf of Governor Busbee, the Education Commission of the States and the task force on career education.	April 1978
Meeting of the American Vocational Association on the Contribution of Vocational Education to Job Creation and Development, to explore ways of strengthening linkages between career education and vocational education in efforts to develop, economically, to encourage entrepreneurial activity, etc.	May 1978
Office of the Governor (Alaska), Alaska State Board of Education and the State coordinator of career education, to interpret the ECS career education program and other education/work related activities to the governor and to the state board of education; to confer with the state career education coordinator on the status of legislative and collaborative development in that state.	May 1978
Career Education project directors meeting, Dillon, Colorado. Meeting with various postsecondary projects to report on the activities of the ECS career education project and to seek the involvement of various postsecondary organizations throughout the country. Approximately 15 people attended.	May 1978
Meeting with members of the Indiana advisory council on career education, the assistant superintendent of education and the state career education coordinator to discuss the advisability of developing career education legislation for the state of Inaiana. Two task force members, Senator Ernest Dean and Beverly Smerling, participated in the meeting. (Note: A career education bill was introduced during the 1979 session of the legislature.)	June 1978
Telephone conversations with the New York State career education coordinator and the chairperson of the state advisory council subcommittee on legislation led to the provision of: (1) existing state career education laws; and (2) a "study bill" tailored to the specifications of the	June 1978

advisory council. The study bill was drafted by the project staff and is currentrly being refined by the subcommittee for future introduction in the legislature.	
Meeting, in Denver, with several staff members of the Center for Education and Work of the National Manpower Institute to discuss areas for future cooperative activity. Areas of project activities were discussed along with possible areas of joint activity (particularly with respect to the provision of technical assistance to the states).	June 1978
ECS annual meeting, Indianapolis, to report on the activities of the career education project to ECS Commissioners; to present a career education resolution to the Resolutions Committee and to plan for future activities in career education sponsored by the Commission.	June 1978
Meeting with the director of Indo-Chinese education and various Colorado projects related to Vietnamese education programs to explain the importance of career education in planning for Vietnamese students.	June 1978
Chief State School Officers Institute to address this group on linkages between vocational education and career education; political implications. Approximately 75 persons attended.	August 1978
Participated in panel on statewide networking at one of four regional conferences sponsored by the National Manpower Institute. The theme of the conferences was "Enhancing Education-Work Transitions for Youth: The Community Collaboration Approach."	August 1978
Office of the Governor (Georgia). Meeting with Governor Busbee and staff to plan for the second meeting of the national task force on career education.	August 1978
Meeting to provide testimony from the national task force on ECS project activities at the meeting of the National Advisory Council on Career Education and to comment on the relationship between state legislative activity and P.L. 95-207.	September 1978
Career Education Project Directors meeting, Washington, D.C.	October 1978

Colorado State Career Education Advisory Council. A meeting to develop priority directions for 1979-80 and beyond.	November 1978
Council of Chief State School Officers annual meeting, Phoenix, Arizona, to meet with the career education advisory committee, subcommittee and others on the relationship between career education and vocational activities and various state and local regulatory structures, particularly as they affect the awarding of academic credit in nontraditional education settings. Apprroximately 75 people attended.	November 1978
Council of Chief State School Officers (Career Education Coordinators Regional Meeting) to participate in the technical assistance meeting in Salt Lake City, to interpret the progress of the ECS project particularly on matters relating to legislation to western regional coordinators.	November 1978
Speech and Hearing Association meeting, San Francisco, California. Meeting with the incoming president of ASHA and others regarding the implications of career education for special populations, particularly speech and hearing students and to explore ways the ECS national project might be of assistance to this national organization.	November 1978
Task force subcommittee meeting, Atlanta, Georgia, to meet with the task force subcommittee on legislation to review draft reports on publications relating to legislation and plan for the next meeting of the full task force.	December 1978
Task force subcommittee meeting, New York, to meet with the task force subcommittee on collaboration to review draft reports on publications relating to collaboration of business, industry and labor and to plan for the next meeting of the full task force.	December 1978
Meeting with National Advisory Council on Career Education, San Antonio, Texas to explain the legislative activities in the states, particularly in the southern and south central region and to seek ways of cooperating with the State of Texas in increasing collaboration of industry,	December 1978

education and labor and political leaders at the policy level. Tentative plans were also made at that time to explore specific ways of assistance that the ECS project might provide during the second project year.

Colorado State Career Education Advisory Council. A meeting to develop action plans and to establish activities to implement those plans. — January 1979

National Career Education Task Force meeting, New York City. The purpose of this meeting was to review final drafts of publications and receive task force recommendations. — January 1979

Council of Chief State School Officers (career education coordinators regional meeting) in Little Rock, Arkansas, to participate in technical assistance program and to interpret state legislative needs for career education coordinators and others. — January 1979

Conference planning meeting in Austin, Texas with state career education advisory committee and state career education coordinator. — February 1979

National career education coordinators meeting, to conduct panel on state policies and legislation in career education. — February 1979

Experience based career education meeting, meeting with Texas Caucus on state legislative needs in Texas and to interpret state legislative activities to sponsors in the Texas legislature. — February 1979

Meeting with career education advisory committee of the Council of Chief State School Officers in regard to joint activities involving the Council's career education project and the work of the ECS national task force on career education. Also attending meeting of the National Governor's Association. — March 1979

National School Volunteers Association annual meeting, Anaheim, California to conduct a legislative workshop for school — March 1979

volunteers and to serve as chairperson on a panel reviewing policy activities of industry, labor and education.	
Meeting with Council of Chief State School Officers Technical Assistance Group in Chicago, Illinois to present legislative workshop to career education coordinators and others.	April 1979
Meeting with National Association on Industry-Education Cooperation to conduct legislative and policy workshop.	May 1979
Meeting with regional migrant education conference to interpret the role of career education in providing improved services for migrant education persons, Salt Lake City, Utah.	May 1979
Meeting with state advisory council, representatives from Alabama State Legislature to provide information on career education legislative and policy activities throughout the United States.	May 1979
Annual meeting of the Education Commission of the States to report on progress of the ECS task force on career education and to seek resolution in support of career education activities of the Commission (in cooperation with six members of the national task force), Seattle, Washington.	August 1979
Final meeting of ECS task force, Washington, D.C., to plan for future activities of the task force (expansion to develop proposed forum on education/work).	July 1979
President's Task Force on Youth Unemployment. ECS staff and task force members Dick Arnold, AT&T; Jim Clark, General Electric; Walter Davis, AFL-CIO participate in various panels and individual presentations at the President's task force meeting in Baltimore, Maryland.	November 1979

Northwest Regional Laboratory (northwest connection) to present legislative information and conduct a legislative workshop on career education.	March 1980

The above special activities are only the major consultative activities engaged in by project staff and task force members. Individual task force members participated in numerous national task force meetings throughout the United States over a period of two years. In addition, the individual task force members and ECS staff responded to numerous requests via written communications, telephone conversations and conference calls throughout the two year period. The above listing is provided to give some flavor of the extensive range of consultative activities that were requested and provided by the task force and staff (for more detailed reports see previous performance reports issued by the ECS project).

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20208

CAREER EDUCATION PROGRAM

PARTICIPANT SUMMARY

NOTE. Participants include those DIRECTLY served by the project or, in the case of most parents and persons in the business/labor/industry community, who actively assist in project implementation. "Actively assist" includes efforts such as serving as resource persons, serving on Advisory Groups, providing work experience, etc.

FORM APPROVED
OMB NO. 51-R1187

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS (see NOTE above) WHO ARE	RACE/ETHNICITY (all Participants including Handicapped, Gifted and Talented, and Low Income)						OF THE TOTAL (column (6)) NUMBER WHO ARE			OF THE TOTAL (column (6)) NUMBER WHO ARE	
	AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE (1)	ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER (2)	BLACK/ NEGRO (3)	CAUCASIAN/ WHITE (4)	HISPANIC (5)	TOTAL (sum of columns (1) through (5)) (6)	HANDI-CAPPED (7)	GIFTED AND TALENTED (8)	LOW INCOME (9)	MALE (10)	FEMALE (11)
STUDENTS											
ELEMENTARY (K-6)											
MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH (7-9)											
SENIOR HIGH (10-12)											
2-YEAR COLLEGE											
4-YEAR COLLEGE											
ADULTS (non-matriculated)											
SUB-TOTAL											
EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL											
TEACHERS											
COUNSELORS			1	1		2					2
ADMINISTRATORS				1		1				Total 10	1
MEMBERS OF THE BUSINESS/ LABOR/INDUSTRY COMMUNITY			1	6		7					
PARENTS											
OTHER (specify) Govt. Officials				3		3					
TOTAL						13					

OE FORM 467, 3/76

OTHER:

National Task Force on Career Ed	0	0	2	11	0	13				9	4

CAREER EDUCATION TASK FORCE

April 1978

Chairperson:

The Honorable George Busbee
Governor of Georgia
Executive Department
State Capitol
Atlanta, Georgia 30334
(404) 656-1776

Members:

Richard Arnold, Manager
Education Relations
American Telephone & Telegraph Co.
195 Broadway
New York, New York 10007
(212) 393-6331

Ms. Marsha L. Barnett
Supervisor
Sales and Marketing, P.S.D.
Chrysler Learning, Inc.
26001 Lawrence
Center Line, Michigan 48015
(313) 497-0615

The Honorable Harry A. Chapman, Jr.
State Senator and Chairman,
Education Committee
P. O. Box 10167
Greenville, South Carolina 29601
(803) 233-4351

Mr. E. J. Clark, Manager
Educational Communications Programs
General Electric Company
3135 Easton Turnpike
Fairfield, Connecticut 06431
(203) 373-2211

Walter G. Davis
Director of Education
AFL-CIO
815 - 16th St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 637-5000

The Honorable Ernest H. Dean
State Senator
165 South Third East
American Fork, Utah 84003
(801) 756-2310

Lee Hamilton, Vice President
National Association of Manufacturers
1776 F St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 331-3700

Carroll M. Hutton, Director
Department of Education
International Union
United Auto Workers
8000 East Jefferson Ave.
Detroit, Michigan 48214
(313) 926-5000

Dr. Sidney P. Marland, Jr., President
The College Board
888 Seventh Street
New York, New York 10019
(212) 582-6210

Ms. Rayma Page, Chairman
Lee County School Board
2412 Kent Avenue
Fort Myers, Florida 33907
(813) 936-1524

Mrs. Beverly Smerling, ACSW
Director, Social Programs, Inc.
2552 W. Lake of the Isles Blvd
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55405
(612) 377-1817

Ms. Kathleen A. Styles, Counselor
Community College of Baltimore
3825 Sequoia Avenue
Baltimore, Maryland 21215
(301) 396-0380

Ex officio member: Dr. Kenneth Hoyt
Office of Career Education
Office of Education/DHEW
7th & D Sts., S.W., Room 3100
Washington, D.C. 20201
(202) 245-2284

Office of the Governor
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

George Busbee
GOVERNOR

Norman Underwood
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

March 1, 1979

The President of the United States
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

During the past year, I have served as the chairman of the Education Commission of the States' task force on career education. I accepted that responsibility because of my interest in furthering practices and concepts that have a real potential for improving our education system.

In general, the task force has dealt with career education issues at the state level. Our work has ranged from the development of state policies and legislative alternatives to encouraging the active involvement in education of business, industry and labor. As you know, career education is a means of both enriching and revitalizing education through local community involvement in school programs and activities.

We have found that state policy makers are quite responsive to the need for career education. In many cases they have already established strong career education policies and programs, and other states are actively developing them. Career education is still in its infancy, but extensive progress has been made and a significant momentum has been gained.

Certainly, the leadership of the federal government has been a positive force in encouraging progress and helping to build that momentum. Although actual expenditures have been relatively small, they have been used to encourage and promote efforts to build a foundation for career education in many states. Funds have also been made available to states to encourage planning efforts needed for statewide career education implementation.

The enactment and funding of the new Career Education Incentive Act has further stimulated activity at both state and local levels. Commitments have been made that were based on the prospect of federal fund availability -- a reasonable expectation after the 95th Congress appropriated $32.5 million for this purpose. If these funds are withdrawn, many

activities that were dependent on them will have to be discontinued. Since the Act stipulates that no funds can be appropriated in the remaining four years unless funds are appropriated in FY 1979, the rescission of these funds has the effect of making the Act null and void.

Therefore, the rescission symbolically opposes career education concepts -- a position that is of more concern to me than the actual loss of funds. On behalf of the task force, therefore, I would like to urge you to reconsider your present position with respect to the Career Education Incentive Act. The task force believes this Act is a very worthwhile effort that has profound implications for our system of education.

Sincerely,

George Busbee

George Busbee

GB:nhm

Education Commission of the States
300 LINCOLN TOWER • 1860 LINCOLN STREET
(303) 893-5200 • DENVER, COLORADO 80203

April 12, 1978

The Honorable Daniel J. Flood
Chairman, Subcommittee on Labor/
Health, Education and Welfare
House Appropriations Committee
108 Cannon House Office Building
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Representative Flood:

We, at the Education Commission of the States, have watched with great interest the development and enactment of the Career Education Incentive Act, PL95-207, which was signed into law by President Carter on December 13, 1977. I understand that it is currently subject to the deliberations and action of the Congressional appropriations committees.

I share with many others the concern that, in spite of overwhelming Congressional support for this legislation, and in spite of widespread support from community and educational leaders across the nation, it may yet be invalidated as a result of lack of funding. That would indeed be unfortunate.

At both the state and local levels, there has been widespread response to the concept of career education. Both state and local education agencies have been actively developing materials and inservice training programs across the country to infuse career education into the curriculum of the schools. Even more importantly, one finds strong efforts at both the state and local levels to develop collaborative relationships with business, industry and labor in the formulation and implementation of career education policies and programs -- a development that has long-range implications for education, for individuals and for communities.

Much of this activity has been generated, and/or encouraged, by the Congress, particularly through the provisions of the Education Amendments of 1974 (PL93-380). Now, although a great deal of progress has been made, the bringing together of business, industry, labor, government and education around the goals of career education is far from complete. The Career Education Incentive Act would greatly encourage the development of productive collaborative relationships where they do not exist, and would strengthen those that do exist.

I would like to add our strong support to that of the many organizations and individuals across the country who have supported this important piece of legislation, and to urge its full funding. An expanded statement of our concern and our interest in the Career Education Incentive Act is enclosed. The statement will be discussed at the first meeting of the Education Commission of the States' national task force on career education, chaired by Governor George D. Busbee of Georgia. The meeting will be held on April 20-21, and any action taken by the task force will be reported to you at that time.

Sincerely,

Warren G. Hill
Executive Director

WGH/ca

Statement on

THE CAREER EDUCATION INCENTIVE ACT OF 1977

(PL95-207)

Prepared for
The Subcommittee on Labor/Health, Education and Welfare
of the House Appropriations Committee
Daniel J. Flood, Chairman

Hearings of
April 12-26, 1978

The Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295
(303)861-4917

Last year the Congress enacted, and the President signed, the Career Education Incentive Act (PL95-207). That act is currently before you, as members of the House Appropriations Committee, awaiting your decision on funding. Your deliberations and final action, and that of the Senate Appropriations Committee, will greatly influence the future of career education across the country.

Career education is a concept that is of great significance to our schools and communities and, more specifically, to individual students. Further, it is a means of responding to two related problems that many of us are greatly concerned with -- youth unemployment and, in education, the current emphasis on basic skills development.

During the past year, the Congress authorized over $1 billion under the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (PL95-93). The late Senator Hubert Humphrey described the thrust of the legislation in the following way:

> The Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act specifically addresses itself to the structural unemployment problems confronting youth. The Young Adult Conservation Corps and the youth community conservation and improvements projects created by the bill will provide unemployed youth with the opportunity to become productive wage-earning members of society. It will provide them with an opportunity that they would otherwise never have had. The jobs they will have will not be make-work jobs. They will be jobs which teach them a skill and work habits -- jobs like range management improvement, erosion control, recreation development, rehabilitating public facilities, and repairing low-income housing.
>
> The youth employment and training program set up by the bill will supplement the other provisions of the bill by insuring a long-term attack on the structural unemployment problems of youth. They will reinforce the bill's other programs by providing such services as counseling, activities promoting the education to work transition, bilingual and other important services.[1]

1 Congressional Record, July 21, 1977, p. S-12570.

At the same time, we have seen, nationwide, a growing concern with the quality of education and an increasing emphasis on the teaching of basic skills. It is not the first time in our nation's history that this concern has developed. John Dewey, writing over 75 years ago, has described this recurring interest in the basic skills as follows:

> ...there comes an outcry that children do not write or spell or figure as well as they used to; that they cannot do necessary work in the upper grades, or in the high school, because of lack of ready command of the necessary tools of study. We are told that they are not prepared for business, because their spelling is so poor, their work in addition and multiplication so slow and inaccurate, their handwriting so fearfully and wonderfully made.[2]

And Professor Dewey went on to point out that this concern is not confined to a "few barbarians who are interested simply in turning back the wheels of progress," but that it simply reflects the unreserved faith of the American people in education. When our society has experienced a slippage in the performance of its young people, there has been a renewed interest in, and commitment to, the fundamental basic skills that make learning possible.

These two concerns share a common element that can also be found in career education. Narrowly defined, it is described as "facilitating the transition from school to work." More broadly defined, it is the effort to infuse into education, in all subject areas and at all levels of education, an awareness of the relationship of the subject matter at hand to the future functioning and wellbeing of the student -- as a productive

2 Lawrence A. Cremin, ed., American Education: Its Men, Ideas and Institutions, (New York: Arno Press and the New York Times, 1969), p. 15.

member of the labor force, as a citizen, a family member and an individual.

This concept has met with an overwhelming response in the past five or six years because it is recognized as an effective way to improve the overall quality of education[3] as well as a way of enhancing both the employability and employment of young people. The development of new curriculum materials at all levels of education that emphasize careers -- the opportunities and attendant responsibilities that specific careers represent -- has brought a very high level of relevance to the learning situation.

At the same time, the rapid establishment of collaborative working relationships between schools and the business-industry-labor communities -- an integral part of the career education movement -- has greatly facilitated the transition from school to work for countless numbers of young people. That is not to say that career education can create jobs for young people. Job creation must be dealt with in other ways. Career education can, however, provide the awareness and preparation that young people need to enter the labor market successfully, and it can establish the linkages within the community that allow them to do so if the jobs are there.

Theoretically then, career education is closely allied with the ongoing effort to reduce youth unemployment through programs such as the Youth

---

3 At the state level, it is increasingly common to find new efforts to improve the quality of education through the development of basic skills or through "real world" experience, such as career education programs provide, or both. For example, the Pennsylvania Department of Education has given top priority to a five-year project "...to define the skills, knowledge and abilities young people need to cope with the demands of adult life; to include people from the community as active participants in the educational system; and to make sure students are actually prepared for the world beyond graduation." In California, new legislation (AB65) emphasizes career education as an option that school districts may utilize in developing "school improvement plans" to receive funding under the act. At the federal level, the Educational Quality Act which is currently being developed by the Administration provides for both basic skills development and school-to-work programs.

Employment and Demonstration Projects Act; it is certainly one of the most effective tools available to us in terms of improving the quality of general education and the development of basic skills. From a practical, rather than a theoretical standpoint, however, career education also has much to recommend it.

We have, at the local, state and federal levels, expended significant resources to develop curriculum materials and inservice training programs designed to make career education an integral part of the education system. In other words, we have not been developing a curriculum for a single categorical program designed to either acquaint students with career options and/or to provide a specific set of skills that will enhance their employability. While such programs exist (career guidance and counseling on the one hand, vocational education on the other) they do not in themselves constitute career education. The materials and programs that have been developed for career education are available to all teachers and may be used in any learning situation. The development of these materials and skills over the past few years represent an extensive commitement of resources.

Second, we have made an important beginning in terms of establishing collaborative working relationships between schools, business, industry and labor. Where these relationships have been established, they have received the enthusiastic support and active involvement of educators, employers, students and parents. There has been no question that these efforts have been beneficial and no question that the extra effort has been more than compensated for in terms of results (better access to jobs for young people, better trained and motivated young people entering the labor market).

Third, the states have, with federal assistance, undertaken needs assessment and planning activities in career education. Based on the ex-

perience gained from federally-funded demonstration projects, state planners have developed long-term plans for implementing career education on a broad-scale basis. They have worked with advisory councils and communities in developing state career education plans and have found widespread support on the part of parents, students and educators -- and on the part of business and industry. Labor organizations are also becoming increasingly involved in the development and expansion of career education. A momentum has developed around state planning efforts that has significant potential for the years immediately ahead.

The Career Education Incentive Act is designed to bring this investment and effort to fruition. It will greatly encourage the full implementation of career education in the nation's schools and it will permit the strengthening and further establishment of business-industry-education-labor relationships. It will provide a span of five years to achieve the objectives of career education, after which time there may be no further need for large scale expenditures since career education will have become an integral part of the education system.

The emphasis on state leadership in this legislation is a welcome and appreciated one. Career education, for the reasons given earlier, has been an area of active interest at the state level. Many states have enacted career education legislation while, in others, state education agencies and boards of education have pioneered new career education programs and services. These efforts have been given added emphasis by the emerging interest in improving the quality of education, described earlier, through the strengthening of career education programs.

Because of the widespread support for career education at the state level, the Education Commission of the States (ECS) has sought and received funding from the U.S. Office of Career Education to assist states in the development of career education policies. With the guidance of a national task force on career education, chaired by Governor George D. Busbee of Georgia, ECS will be assisting the states to formulate comprehensive career education policies and legislation through the collaboration of business, industry, education and labor. The emphasis on state leadership in career education contained in this legislation is timely, and it will be well received.

This emphasis on state leadership represents a welcome departure from many prevailing practices at the federal level, such as the bypassing of states, that have highly undesirable consequences for our system of education. That is not to say, however, that this piece of legislation is flawless. The nature of career education results in relatively high start-up and developmental costs that decline to lower levels as the program becomes infused into the general educational program. However, this act provides an incentive for increased state expenditures without regard to the possibility that some states may have already met their major start-up costs and be in a position to lower their expenditures for career education. Such states will either be penalized for their leadership in career education, or they will be required to make expenditures that are no longer necessary.

Further, these declining total costs are not reflected in the Career Education Incentive Act because the decreasing federal match in the fourth

and fifth years must be offset by increased state participation -- so that the total remains constant. Matching provisions that require a level, rather than an increasing, state commitment would more accurately reflect appropriate expenditure levels for career education and they would also help states more realistically plan their long-term financial matching obligation.

These difficulties can be summarized by pointing to both the lack of flexibility in the legislation, and to the failure of the legislation to take into account the unique characteristics of career education. Legislation of this kind should be sufficiently flexible to allow states with substantially developed programs -- that are consistent with the legislation under consideration -- to build on their past efforts rather than to needlessly repeat them. If, in fact, the program under consideration is to be infused into the general educational program, then incentive provisions should take into consideration the gradual decline in necessary expenditures for both the state and federal government.

It is important that this legislation be fully funded. It has been authorized at a funding level that will allow states to adequately develop career education programs. Any significant variation between authorization levels and funding levels will present a genuine dilemma at the state and local levels -- particularly if the funding level is so low that successful implementation of the plan is virtually impossible. If the states are to respond to this opportunity in an effective way, they must not be left stranded with a workable plan, an enthusiastic offer of support from the schools and the business, industry and labor communities, and yet crippled to the point that they cannot meet their own obligations under the plan.

We hope that the appropriations committees will act to fully fund PL95-207. It is a modest investment that has the capability of achieving important results. It represents that last effort that so often spells the critical difference between success and failure.

Education Commission of the States

CAREER EDUCATION PROJECT

Objectives, Tasks and Subtasks

Nov. 15, 1977

DATE SCHEDULED FOR COMPLETION	OBJECTIVES (TASKS AND SUBTASKS)	EVALUATION MEASURES, PROCEDURE AND RATIONALE
	I. Complete project start-up activities by the end of the first quarter.	
	1. Select project director and staff.	
10/14/77	1.1 Advertise positions and screen ECS personnel files	Project staff selected by scheduled completion dates. ECS affirmative action plan and personnel policies followed.
10/21/77	1.2 Conduct personnel interviews and select staff	
	2. Prepare project summary for distribution to state educational leaders	Project summary prepared and disseminated by scheduled completion dates. The project summary will be designed as a brochure and will include a form to be filled out by individuals who wish to be included on the project's mailing list. The number of returned forms will indicate, to some extent, the degree of interest generated by the brochure. Responses from the brochure will be tabulated at the end of the project year and included in the year-end evaluation report. The report will also include the date the brochure is completed, dates that it is revised and reprinted, and total number of brochures disseminated.
10/28/77	2.1 Write and edit project summary	
11/4/77	2.2 Print and distribute project summary	
	3. Develop detailed project methodology	
11/11/77	3.1 Review general project methodology as proposed	Project methodology reviewed and refined by scheduled completion dates.
11/18/77	3.2 Refine project methodology	
	4. Compile project mailing list	Mailing list compiled by scheduled completion dates. The mailing list, as a major communications device, will be evaluated in a number of ways: (1) size and rate of growth; (2) responsiveness (i.e., ability to target information/
11/18/77	4.1 Review and update current mailing list.	

DATE SCHEDULED FOR COMPLETION	OBJECTIVES (TASKS AND SUBTASKS)	EVALUATION MEASURES, PROCEDURE AND RATIONALE
12/2/77	4.2 Add interested persons, agencies, organizations through selective review of state and federal leaders in business, labor, government and education	reports/materials to individual interests and needs); and (3) efficiency of operation. ECS' computerized system permits, at a reasonable cost, the development of a mailing list that is coded by name, state, occupational affiliation, subject area, etc. This system, as utilized by the Career Education Project, will be evaluated on the basis of the criteria listed above, and the number of mailed items will be included with the final report.
	5. Conduct sample interviews with national and state leaders to identify and delineate key policy and legislative issues	Interviews completed by scheduled completion dates. Criteria for selection of interviewees will include: (1) geographic area (regionally, urban/rural, etc.); (2) interest groups (women, minorities, handicapped, etc.); and (3) business, industry, labor, government and education representation. Although interviews will be conducted informally, a set of basic questions will be asked at each interview to assure that each person has an opportunity to comment on a wide range of issues and concerns in career education.
12/16/77	5.1 Telephone survey	
12/23/77	5.2 Personal interviews	
	6. Present progress report to ECS steering committee and make recommendations for task force appointments	6.1 and 6.2 The evaluation report will indicate when the progress report was completed and disseminated to the members of the steering committee and the response of steering committee members to the report (to the extent that information is available). An evaluation form will be included with the report and the results of that evaluation effort will be included in the evaluation report.
12/16/77	6.1 Write progress report	
12/23/77	6.2 Print and distribute progress report	
	6.3 Select task force members	6.3 ECS has an established procedure for selecting and appointing task force members. The evaluation will be based on compliance with that procedure.

DATE SCHEDULED FOR COMPLETION	OBJECTIVES (TASKS AND SUBTASKS)	EVALUATION MEASURES, PROCEDURE AND RATIONALE
	II. Through survey activities, determine the nature and extent of participation of business and industry/labor communities in career education policy development and implementation in each state (end of the first project year).	
1/6/78	1. Develop survey instruments	Survey instruments developed by scheduled completion dates. Survey instruments will cover a comprehensive range of subjects that are both directly and indirectly related to career education, but will focus on the major issues and concerns identified through the informal interview process. It will also be necessary to have open-ended questions and content specific questions. Careful attention will be given to completeness and logical independence (i.e., each question covers one topic and does not overlap with another, making possible an unambiguous response) of content-specific questions. The questionnaire as a whole will be reviewed by the Department of Research and Information Services in terms of: (1) usefulness of information sought (responsiveness to issues/concerns raised in interviews); (2) comprehensiveness; (3) clarity; and (4) efficiency. Field testing will permit additional corrections if they are needed.
1/6/78	1.1 Field test instruments	
1/20/78	1.2 Revise instruments	
	2. Survey state career education coordinators	State career education coordinators surveyed by scheduled completion date. Evaluation criteria for the survey instrument will also be applied to survey results (i.e., are responses to content specific questions unambiguous?, etc.) In addition, the survey instrument and the analyses of the data produced will be disseminated for review to selected individuals previously interviewed. Their criticisms and comments will be requested and included in the year-end evaluation report.
2/24/78	2.1 Mail questionnaire	
	2.2 Telephone follow-up	
	2.3 Analyze data	
	2.4 Compile data review	

DATE SCHEDULED FOR COMPLETION	OBJECTIVES (TASKS AND SUBTASKS)	EVALUATION MEASURES, PROCEDURE AND RATIONALE
	3. Survey business, industry and labor	Survey completed by scheduled completion dates. Evaluation criteria same as II.2. The task force meeting is viewed as a major vehicle for: (1) developing state policy alternatives utilizing data from the survey questionnaires; and (2) focusing national attention on successful approaches at the state level to involve business, industry and labor in career education policy. Task force meetings will be evaluated in terms of productivity (e.g., development of a consensus as to acceptable alternative approaches for state consideration); press coverage and follow-up activities at the state and national level (to the extent that information is known to the project staff at the end of the project year). Emphasis will be placed, in the evaluation report, on follow-up activities on the part of task force members.
2/24/78	3.1 Mail questionnaire	
	3.2 Telephone follow-up	
	3.3 Analyze data	
	3.4 Compile data review	
3/30/78	3.5 Convene task force to review data (task force meeting no. 1)	
	4. Report results to state leaders and publicize data through news media	Results reported and report results publicized by scheduled completion dates. Reports will include evaluation forms tailored to the various groups that compose the constituency of the project (business, industry, labor, etc.). Their responses will be compiled and results will be included in the year-end evaluation report.
4/7/78	4.1 Prepare special reports for target consumers (e.g., political and educational leaders).	
4/7/78	4.2 Prepare news releases	The number of news releases and dates released will be included in the evaluation report.
9/30/78 (continuous)	4.3 Present results at state and national meetings	Staff presentations at state and national meetings will be described in the evaluation report as well as any responses to them received by the project.
	5. Identify alternative state plans for increasing collaboration among key state leaders in business, labor, education and politics.	Alternative state plans identified by scheduled completion dates. This task represents the initial effort to introduce to state leaders alternative approaches identified through surveys, activities and recommendations from the task force. Information will be included in the year-end report on the number of state leaders contacted and their responses to the alternative approaches recommended. This part of the
5/12/78	5.1 Contact state educators	

DATE SCHEDULED FOR COMPLETION	OBJECTIVES (TASKS AND SUBTASKS)	EVALUATION MEASURES, PROCEDURE AND RATIONALE
5/12/78	5.2 Contact state political leaders	evaluation report will include state reports, based on data collected by the project and contacts with state leaders on possible future activity in each state.
5/12/78	5.3 Contact key leaders in private and public sectors	
	6. Implement alternative plans for increasing participation of business/labor in career education	Number of alternative plans implemented. As the project staff works with state leaders to identify appropriate approaches to involving business/industry/labor in career education policy development, it will also identify ways in which the staff can assist in implementing various approaches. For example, it is often helpful for an "outside" agency such as ECS to host a meeting that brings together state leaders who would not otherwise contact one another -- in this case, representatives of business, labor, industry, government and education. In terms of evaluation the extent to which the Career Education staff assists in implementing the strategies developed in (5) above will be noted. It should be noted that this task is expected to be initiated in the first project year but will continue during the second year of funding, if granted. Thus, a progress report on this activity will be included in the year-end evaluation report, but the task will not have been completed at that time.
9/30/78 (continuous)	6.1 Work with key education, policy and business/labor groups on a request basis in implementing plans for participating in policy decision making at state levels (e.g., in conjunction with legislative subcommittees, state advisory councils, industry/education councils, governors, study committees, or other projects or political/education organizations with career education policy interests). All direct assistance will be on a request basis and will be provided within the limitations of project resources (staff and budget).	

DATE SCHEDULED FOR COMPLETION	OBJECTIVES (TASKS AND SUBTASKS)	EVALUATION MEASURES, PROCEDURE AND RATIONALE
	III. Identify, classify and continuously report federal and state policies, laws and regulations that have implications for planning, financing and implementing career education programs at state and local levels throughout first project year	Policies, laws and regulations identified, classified and reported, March 30, 1978 through October 1, 1978.
	1. Initiate, develop and expand data collection procedures	
3/30/78	1.1 Review ECS data collection procedures	1.1 Data collection procedures reviewed. ECS has developed a manual (McBee card system) coding and sorting system that will be reviewed and adapted to the specific needs of the Career Education Project. Also, ECS' Department of Research and Information Services has collected a substantial amount of information on state legislation, which is directly or indirectly related to career education. It will be reviewed analyzed and added to the project's information base. [A report on these activities will be included in the evaluation report that contains a function description of the information system developed by the project (from the existing ECS system) and an overview of the legislation and related materials collected from the Department of Research and Information Services.
3/30/78	1.2 Develop data collection plan	1.2 and 1.3 Data collection plan developed and initiated. The data collection plan will provide for the acquisition of federal and state laws, regulations pending legislation, policy statements, etc., that are directly related to career education. It will be organized by subject matter, state (except for federal legislation) and date. [The evaluation report will include a description of data collected and the amount of data available from the project (i.e., number of laws, bills, regulations, etc., in each subject area).]
4/14/78	1.3 Initiate data collection effort	

DATE SCHEDULED FOR COMPLETION	OBJECTIVES (TASKS AND SUBTASKS)	EVALUATION MEASURES, PROCEDURE AND RATIONALE
	2. Establish liaison with governors' offices, legislative reference bureaus, federal and state education agencies and business and labor organizations (e.g., NABM, NAM, AFL-CIO) as specific resources for this data collection effort	Number, nature and dates of contacts established.
4/14/78	2.1 With task force assistance, contact selected organizations for information	2.1 A letter will be sent to state legislative reference bureaus, departments of education, etc., to inform them of the nature of the project, to offer assistance by the project and to request information, legislation, regulations, etc., as appropriate. Congressional committee staff members and representatives of federal agencies and national organizations will be contacted by telephone for materials and information. A description of these contacts will be included in the evaluation report.
9/30/78 (continuous)	2.2 Solicit assistance from other ECS programs for legislative and policy information	2.2 Assistance received from other ECS projects and departments will be noted in the evaluation report.
4/21/78	2.3 Review governors' state-of-state messages for career education content	2.3 The information obtained from governors' offices and governors' messages, including state-of-the-state reports will be analyzed and a report dealing with that analysis will be included in the evaluation report.
	3. Analyze federal and state policies and legislation for career education implications (O.E., Department of Commerce, Department of Labor, Vocational Education, Special Education, etc.). Initiate by 9/30/78 but continue into second year, pending funding.	Number of types of analytic efforts initiated.

DATE SCHEDULED FOR COMPLETION	OBJECTIVES (TASKS AND SUBTASKS)	EVALUATION MEASURES, PROCEDURE AND RATIONALE
9/30/78 (continuous)	3.1 Contact each organization and agency 3.2 Combine, compare and organize data	This analysis will demonstrate how various agencies at the state and federal level have attempted to achieve similar career education policy goals (i.e., career awareness, preparation, placement, etc.) for the specific target populations they serve. This analysis, coupled with the analysis described in 2.3 above, will contribute to the state reports described earlier and the formulation of strategies to improve individual state policies/legislation in career education (see Parts II.5 and II.6, above).
	4. Prepare data for dissemination	Data disseminated on schedule. As the first task force meeting focused on the extent to which states effectively involved business, industry and labor in the formulation of career education policy, the second meeting will focus on how state and federal governments have acted to further the concept and practice of career education. Task force members will identify alternative procedures (governors' activities, legislation, regulations, etc.) that have proven effective. (Task force members will receive sufficient written material in advance of the meeting to facilitate this effort.) Task force members will also review and evaluate the materials and information developed by the project and recommend future directions for the project. The meeting and task force recommendations will be publicized. Evaluation procedures will be similar to those used for meeting no. 1.
9/15/78	4.1 Convene task force for review of data on policies and legislation, and for the review of outcomes of preceding activities (task force meeting no. 2)	
9/30/78 (continuous)	5. Report and publicize task force recommendations and publicize via news media	Recommendations reported and publicized. A report will be included in the evaluation report on news coverage of this meeting (to the extent that information is available at the end of the project year).

DATE SCHEDULED FOR COMPLETION	OBJECTIVES (TASKS AND SUBTASKS)	EVALUATION MEASURES, PROCEDURE AND RATIONALE
	IV. Develop and recommend alternative approaches to strengthening state education policies and legislation through the collaborative efforts of the constituency of the project	Successful approaches identified and reported to task force and constituency.
9/30/78 (continuous)	1. Identify existing approaches to strengthening state policies and legislation 1.1 Correspond with state leaders 1.2 Summarize findings 1.3 Report data to task force 1.4 Disseminate to ECS constituency policies and legistation	1.1 and 1.2 The purpose of these tasks is to: (1) identify alternative state legislative approaches that have been successful in promoting the career education concept; and (2) to develop a sufficiently concise and readable analysis of these approaches that they can be replicated in other states if appropriate. 1.3 and 1.4 Dissemination activities will be ongoing as successful approaches are identified to: (1) facilitate the work of the task force at its second meeting (see Part III, 4.1 above); and (2) to encourage and facilitate legislative action at the state wherever possible.
9/30/78	2. Prepare model legislation (sample) for use by project constituency in developing model state legislation	Model legislation available by scheduled completion date.
	2.1 Draft legislation	2.1 The model legislation will include alternative approaches to meeting stated policy objectives, based on the successful approaches identified in the task described above (Part IV, 1). It will be possible then, to review several legislative alternatives for implementing policy objectives.
	2.2 Submit to task force for review 2.3 Revise drafts	2.2 and 2.3 The task force will be asked to review the alternatives identified at the second task force meeting and to arrive at a consensus on which of them should be included in the model legislation; the legislation will be revised in accordance with the recommendations of the task force which will, along with a synopsis of the model legislation, be included in the year end report. The model legislation

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

CAREER EDUCATION PROGRAM

PARTICIPANT SUMMARY

NOTE: Participants include those DIRECTLY served by the project or, in the case of most parents and persons in the business/labor/industry community, who actively assist in project implementation. "Actively assist" includes efforts such as serving as resource persons, serving on Advisory Groups, providing work experience, etc.

FORM APPROVED
OMB NO. 51-R1187

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS (see NOTE above) WHO ARE	RACE/ETHNICITY (all Participants including Handicapped, Gifted and Talented, and Low Income)						OF THE TOTAL (column (6)) NUMBER WHO ARE			OF THE TOTAL (column (6)) NUMBER WHO ARE	
	AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE (1)	ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER (2)	BLACK/ NEGRO (3)	CAUCASIAN/ WHITE (4)	HISPANIC (5)	TOTAL (sum of columns (1) through (5)) (6)	HANDI-CAPPED (7)	GIFTED AND TALENTED (8)	LOW INCOME (9)	MALE (10)	FEMALE (11)
STUDENTS											
ELEMENTARY (K-6)											
MIDDLE/JUNIOR HIGH (7-9)											
SENIOR HIGH (10-12)											
2-YEAR COLLEGE											
4-YEAR COLLEGE											
ADULTS (non-matriculated)											
SUB-TOTAL											
EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL											
TEACHERS											
COUNSELORS			1	1		2					2
ADMINISTRATORS				1		1				Total 10	1
MEMBERS OF THE BUSINESS/ LABOR/INDUSTRY COMMUNITY			1	6		7					
PARENTS											
OTHER (specify): Govt. Officials				3		3					
TOTAL						13					

OE FORM 467, 2/76

OTHER:

National Task Force on Career Ed	0	0	2	11	0	13				9	4

P. 61 (PERSONNEL RPT)

99

10

FINANCIAL STATUS REPORT

(Follow instructions on the back)

1. FEDERAL AGENCY AND ORGANIZATIONAL ELEMENT TO WHICH REPORT IS SUBMITTED	2. FEDERAL GRANT OR OTHER IDENTIFYING NUMBER	OMB Approval No. 80-R0150	PAGE NO.
DHEW/OE	G00-78-2021		1 of 1 PAGES

3. RECIPIENT ORGANIZATION (Name and complete address, including ZIP code)	4. EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER	5. RECIPIENT ACCOUNT NUMBER OR IDENTIFYING NUMBER	6. FINAL REPORT	7. BASIS
Education Commission of the States 1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300 Denver, Colorado 80295	31-0722194	31-3102	[X] YES [ ] NO	[ ] CASH [XX] ACCRUAL

8. PROJECT/GRANT PERIOD (See instructions)		9. PERIOD COVERED BY THIS REPORT	
FROM (Month, day, year)	TO (Month, day, year)	FROM (Month, day, year)	TO (Month, day, year)
10/1/78	11/30/79	10/1/78	1/31/80 *

10. PROGRAMS/FUNCTIONS/ACTIVITIES ▶	(a)	STATUS OF FUNDS (b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	TOTAL (g)
a. Net outlays previously reported	$ 77,549	$	$	$	$	$	$ 77,549
b. Total outlays this report period	101,716						101,716
c. Less: Program income credits	-0-						-0-
d. Net outlays this report period (Line b minus line c)	101,716						101,716
e. Net outlays to date (Line a plus line d)	179,265						179,265
f. Less: Non Federal share of outlays	-0-						-0-
g. Total Federal share of outlays (Line e minus line f)	179,265						179,265
h. Total unliquidated obligations	-0-						-0-
i. Less: Non Federal share of unliquidated obligations shown on line h	-0-						-0-
j. Federal share of unliquidated obligations	-0-						-0-
k. Total Federal share of outlays and unliquidated obligations	179,265						179,265
l. Total cumulative amount of Federal funds authorized	179,999						179,999
m. Unobligated balance of Federal funds	734						734

11. INDIRECT EXPENSE	a. TYPE OF RATE (Place "X" in appropriate box) [X] PROVISIONAL [ ] PREDETERMINED [ ] FINAL [ ] FIXED	b. RATE	c. BASE	d. TOTAL AMOUNT	e. FEDERAL SHARE
		24.80%	143,642	35,623	35,623

12. REMARKS: Attach any explanations deemed necessary or information required by Federal sponsoring agency in compliance with governing legislation

13. CERTIFICATION

I certify to the best of my knowledge and belief that this report is correct and complete and that all outlays and unliquidated obligations are for the purposes set forth in the award documents.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL

Sandy Dennis

TYPED OR PRINTED NAME AND TITLE

Sandy Dennis, Asst. Controller

DATE REPORT SUBMITTED: 2/25/80

TELEPHONE (Area code, number and extension): 861-4917 X 399

* Project reporting period of 10/1/78-1/31/80 includes out-of-period adjustments

STANDARD FORM 269 (1-76) Prescribed by Office of Management and Budget Cir. No. A 110

PCL (PERFORMANCE OCT)